

C) Carr Street, Coogee submissions

Note: These submissions raised issues in relation to the sites at 58-64 Carr Street, Coogee and the proposed DCP objectives and controls (in Part C4 – Medium Density Residential, section 8.2). Given the extent and similarities in issues raised, these issues have been discussed in detail in the Council report. Hence, unless a response is provided in the following table, the response and any recommendations is addressed in the body of the council report.

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01642844	Resident South Coogee	- 58-64 Carr Street: Developable area is too large for restaurant/café, no need for more cafes, restaurants or outdoor dining. Current and new LEP have site zoned residential - keep uses residential.	<i>See full discussion in body of Council report for all submissions.</i>
D01661772	Resident Coogee	- Objection to proposal to rezone 58-60 Carr Street on the basis that this is a relatively quiet area and should remain that way. We don't need anymore bars/cafes in Coogee.	
D01661771	Resident Randwick	- Opposition to commercial development at 58-60 Carr Street. Coogee is already congested in the summer months and then in the winter businesses suffer. - There is no need to develop Coogee more as there are already problems with violence and intimidation around Coogee Bay Hotel and backpackers. This will expand the existing problem in a sensitive area which has a children's play area, women's only pool and is heavily residential.	
D01661774	Resident Coogee	- Opposition to cafes or restaurants at 58-60 Carr St. This is a residential zone that has a quiet ambience where locals frequent when others areas are busy. Adding another restaurant will make it as busy as other areas of the foreshore.	
D01661778	Resident Kingsford	- The parking in the area near the women's pool is already congested. Proposal will make things more difficult for such a delightful community affair full of ambience now.	
D01650350	Resident Coogee	- Objection to the large area outlined for development for 58-60 Carr St in the draft DCP, which is inconsistent with Council resolution that only allows a small café.	
D01661790	Resident Bondi	- Objection to proposal for 58-60 Carr St as it will change the peaceful environment of this end of Coogee. Parking is already	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
	Junction	difficult and further development will make parking impossible. There are already enough cafes and restaurants on Coogee Bay Rd.	
D01661798	Resident Coogee	- Objection to the proposed development on the grounds that it is too big, will attract more people to the area, increase noise, impact on safety, exacerbate parking issues, and result in loss of privacy and views for some residents.	
D01661796	Resident Coogee	- Objection to café/restaurant at 58-60 Carr St. It is too big and excessive. This is a residential zone and any development should be set back from the boundaries. Coogee Beach is family friendly, laidback and the proposal will destroy its ambience. - Parking is already a nightmare and there is already drunken misbehaviour at Coogee Bay Hotel.	
D01661793	Resident Coogee	- Leave Carr St the way it is. There are already enough parking problems-do not create more.	
D01661791	Resident Coogee	- Concerns raised that the proposal will create another Coogee Bay rd at the southern end of Coogee beach and will destroy the ambience and increase parking problems for locals.	
D01661789	Resident Vacluse	- Objection to further development of 58-60 Carr Street. It will ruin the beautiful ambience of the area. There is enough boozing taking place on Coogee Bay Rd and no need to extend these types of activities.	
D01661781	Resident Coogee	- Opposition to café/restaurant at 58-60 Carr st. This is a residential zone and any new development should be setback from the boundaries. The streetscape will result in all concrete and overdeveloped like Crown Plaza and Coogee View apartments.	
D01661776	Resident Coogee and Bungendore	- Objection to increase in volume at 58-60 Carr St. The FSR is already greater than currently permissible and the area is residential. Although DCP refers to small scale café, the area shown as developable is much larger and affects the residential area of Kurrawa Ave and foreshore. - Proposal will result in noise, parking impacts, additional traffic, increased garbage deliveries, overflow of bins on Kurrawa Ave, impact on view lines etc. Residents should expect security in decisions that have been already made.	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01651538	Resident Coogee	- Note: No site reference. Presumably, about 58-60 Carr St. "Noting that the proposal is 'too big', as opposed to 'a small café or restaurant' which was previously agreed. The proposal fails to address community needs and values.	
D01656829	Resident Coogee	- Note: no particular reference - assumed relating to 58-64 Carr Street. "It will bring a commercial activity to a residential area which is not in keeping with the residential amenity of the area."	
D01656831	Resident Coogee	- Bad idea resubmitting the Carr St fiasco... this will create a downgrading of the amenity of the area for no gain... do not let this happen.	
D01656832	Resident Coogee	- The development set out for 58-60 Carr St is too big. The debate at Council last year was about a small cafe or a small restaurant. - It is also odd that whoever is developing this site for commercial use is being given a green light by not having to meet the controls that relate to residential zones such as this area of Carr St is.	
D01656833	Resident Maroubra	- I don't support the size of the proposed commercial development at 58-60 Carr St. The draft document says this is meant to be for a small scale cafe or restaurant so it should be a small scale development area.	
D01656836	Resident Coogee	- I do not support the proposed large commercial development at 58-60 Carr St. Any commercial development should be small-scale. - The proposed DCP requirements for parking would rule out ANY development in this building. I, along with the community and most local business people opposed this development in 2012. Please leave this space as it is	
D01656839	Resident South Coogee	- I was shocked to see a large development in the plan instead of the small Cafe they gave permission for. Who wants more noise & traffic on their doorstep? - I've never not been able to get into a Restaurant near there in the 31 yrs I've lived in & loved the area. Please reconsider.	
D01658332	Resident Coogee	- Objection to draft DCP controls on Carr Street. Proposed commercial controls are contrary to the rest of the draft DCP and goes against the wishes of residents who campaigned to keep the area zoned residential and the Councillors who voted to keep it	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>residential. This is the quiet end of Coogee and no place for more large scale commercial activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The size of the areas for 58-60 Carr Street would permit a large cafe or restaurant, whereas the Council resolution in May 2012 was for a small cafe/restaurant. - The proposal for a boundary to boundary frontage to Carr Street with 3.5 metres height, sitting under 8 storey high rise would add bulk and affect amenity. 	
D01658590	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to how the draft DCP deals with 58-64 Carr Street. Why does Council exempt commercial uses from complying with the residential zoning in this area? - New developments should comply with the R3 Medium Density residential zone. The restaurant/café area identified in the draft DCP exceeds what would be required for a small restaurant/cafe. - If the residential controls were applied, side setback requirements would result in a developable area sufficient for a small scale restaurant/cafe. 	
D01658593	Resident Randwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carr Street should be retained as residential with no change to existing businesses in size or type. Do not extend boundary of development into the foreshore protected area. - The residents have made it clear in previous submissions that they do not want additional development or expansion of existing developments. 	
D01658599	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A large restaurant or café is not supported. It is difficult to find parking in Coogee. Barzura and Ceviche attract people from outside the area who park on the local streets. If there is another restaurant/café in the area, it should be small and made to close before residents come home from work. 	
D01645196	Resident Carr St, Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We wish to record our general support for the Draft DCP as currently exhibited. We thank you for the opportunity to make our comments. 	
D01646094	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal for 58/60 Carr is too large, too bulky and misguided. How will the residents of the unit block park if you do away with the driveway? There is not enough parking there now. If the idea is for 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>the traffic to be redirected to Kurrawa Ave then this will not work as that is a dead end street and it cannot handle with the traffic now on a summer weekend or when delivery trucks and or garbage trucks block the entrance from Carr St.</p> <p>- The developable area outlined in the DCP is huge - and would support a large cafe or restaurant not a small a scale one. Deliveries cannot be from Carr St as there is no parking and no stopping. Council rethink this plan please.</p>	
D01658603	Resident Coogee	- Note that any proposals for commercial or residential development on Carr St (between Kurrawa Ave and Beach St) should meet medium density residential controls in the DCP, with no exceptions.	
D01658604	Resident Coogee	- Note that rezoning of Carr St will result in "the end of Coogee as a safe area in which to live". Note also that there is enough commercial activity in Coogee Bay Road and the overflow from Coogee Bay Hotel at night is disturbing. Request that Council should protect ratepayers' interest.	
D01660265	Resident Coogee	- Object to the double standard being applied at Carr St. The area is not suitable for large commercial development, and should be for smaller developments no bigger than those already there.	
D01660299	Resident Coogee	<p>- Owners of Windsor Towers previously submitted DA which was withdrawn. The owners then applied to have site rezoned to commercial and Council responded by including rezoning in the LEP. This received many objections from residents and it was defeated at the Council meeting of 22 May 2012. The draft DCP now includes the same proposal.</p> <p>- Concern raised that setbacks are not being applied even though the site is zoned Medium Density residential. Why are the owners of Winsor Towers getting special treatment? Keep the setbacks and the other residential controls and apply it to all development proposals for residential and commercial purposes for 58-64 Carr Street.</p>	
D01660301	Resident Coogee	- Concerns raised that the objectives to protect amenity are admirable, they are farcical in regards to the proposal. The public domain of Carr Street is in no need of improvement as the foot and	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>car traffic already overload this area. Encouraging 'high quality design' and 'enhancing street frontage' is more suitable to businesses along Coogee Bay Rd instead of Carr St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft RLEP (stat) is grossly inadequate. Residents will be subject to noise 7am-10am from clients looking for parking, residents will lose parking, and there will be garbage trucks on a daily basis and offloading of goods. - Will there be a 'hotline' for residents to call Council for any breaches of these proposals? This is a high density area and there is confusion about who exactly will benefit from this proposal. There are already 2 cafes at this end of Carr St. 	
D01660303	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opposition to commercial development on foreshore, traffic generation as a result of 58-60 Carr Street. 	
D01660308	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This are of Coogee has a large number of cafes, restaurants etc. and without a plan to increase parking will just bring more traffic trawling Carr St and Beach St searching for parks. The practise of double parking to wait for a park causes many lost tempers and provokes road rage where cars are forced to travel on the opposite side of the road just to get through. I find it strange that these types of projects are suggested by unknown or unidentified council officers on behalf of unidentified beneficiaries. - Council rejected the last attempt to increase commercial activity at the ease end of Carr when unidentified council offers attempt to rezone the eastern end of Carr from residential to Business. Now we see another attempt. -Who are the beneficiaries of this proposal and what is the advantages to local residents who already suffer from noise 24 hours a day and lack of parking. Come on Randwick council think of the residents not the tourists and a few unidentified business people who control the start at 58 Carr St. - -Because a view exists we do no have to exploit every possible access to it. So lack of parking, noise and an increased flow of tourists to a beach which has already ample restaurants cafes and 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>bars. Enough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I appeal to councillors of all parties to consider rejecting this proposal and stop the continued use of council officers to create business opportunities for a few vested interests. Let those at 58 Carr St. sell their holiday flats and buy a cafe somewhere else. Who would want to live or stay in a flat with a Coffee Bay running from 7 am to 10pm plus staff arrivals, deliveries and garbage collection 	
D01660304	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 58-64 Carr St is zoned residential and any development of commercial nature should accord with the zoning. Setback controls should apply to the site and any café/restaurant needs to be smaller. A large scale restaurant/café would impact on street parking and access to this one way street. 	
D01660212	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Another large cafe or restaurant in this area would bring more people (customers and staff) to the immediate area seeking parking, in an area where there is not currently enough parking. A large cafe or restaurant requires many deliveries a day and the area would not cope with more deliveries - As business owners in this area, delivery people have trouble delivering to us and meeting the parking requirements in this part of Carr St. If the proposal was for a small cafe or restaurant for say 20 or so patrons, many of the supplies can be brought in by the operator and deliveries are not required on such a frequent basis. - We pay a premium to have our garbage picked up daily at 10.10pm. We do this so as not to leave garbage out overnight generating smells and being subject to tampering or vandalism. We also do this so not to disturb passers by or neighbours in the morning. - I would be concerned about another large cafe or restaurant choosing not to go to this expense and leaving the garbage out overnight. Once again a smaller cafe or restaurant would not generate so much garbage. - The developable area shown on p.59 comes to the boundary with our building. A wall on our boundary will completely block the light from our side windows on the ground floor and possibly our first 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>floor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the owner of 58-60 Carr St, the eastern wall of the proposed development may involve building on top of the driveway. This would be contrary to the Council resolution restricting commercial use to the ground floor and is not acceptable. - If a terrace is built on top of the driveway, this would directly impact on our Yoga Studio which we operate on the first floor of our building with noise and disturbance. - The draft DCP implies that the driveway to 58-60 Carr St may be either built upon or removed and the DCP makes reference to pedestrian safety. In all the years we have operated we have never known that driveway to give rise to any safety issues. If there is to be limited outdoor dining outside 58-60 Carr St, the driveway would provide a separation and a buffer between us and them. - If there is a large area for outdoor dining it would greatly diminish the experience of dining outside our restaurant. This end of the bay is relatively quiet and peaceful and our customers enjoy the peaceful ambience of dining outside in our limited outdoor dining area. We would be very concerned about any plan to turn this part of Carr St into a noisy, crowded area. That is not the ambience we want at this special part of the bay. - The viability of another cafe or restaurant is questioned when many existing in the area are struggling. Council is urged to reconsider this proposal for 58-60 Carr St and propose instead a small cafe on the ground level only as in fact the draft DCP stipulates and not taking in the driveway. 	
D01660247	Resident Mt Keira	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a regular visitor to Coogee, the low key atmosphere of the southern end of the bay is special when compared with Bondi or Manly. Concerns about the large developable area set out for 58-64 Carr St in the draft DCP. The draft DCP states that any commercial development on this site is to be small scale but this is contradicted with a proposal for a very large developable area that extends right across to the Barzura. - Coogee cannot cope with the traffic and parking issues now and 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>another large restaurant (or cafe) in this residential area will make it worse for everyone as a result of numerous deliveries, more noise, more garbage collection, parking rage and traffic stress etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A small cafe or restaurant of say 20-30 patrons would be less of an impact. The commercial area should be reduced accordingly and be limited to the front of the building. 	
D01660250	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the eastern end of Carr St is zoned Residential, why are residential users expected to comply with the requirements of the zoning? Why is this not also the case for commercial users in respect to foreshore considerations and other amenity issues? -58-60 Carr St is a large developable area for the corner unit block, even though in the DCP it refers to 'small scale.' - There is already a dramatic shortage in parking facilities. Any additional building would greatly increase the noise and traffic issues, with frequent deliveries and garbage collections, and the additional patrons and employees would compete for scarce street parking. - There is a need for local residents to have access to stress relievers, such as walking tracks, parks & beaches? Coogee does not need anymore licensed cafes or restaurants, as there are 2 large hotels within walking distance of each other. - The increase in alcohol fuelled violence over the years cannot be denied. Any development would increase building bulk to the foreshore protected area and any additional construction would create an environmental impact. 	
D01661955	Resident Randwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a regular user of this area I am familiar with the site and the proposed footprint for a cafe or restaurant is excessive in my view. This area should not be overdeveloped and any cafe on the site should be modest in size, along the lines of the two other cafes in Carr St, east of Arden and preferably be contained within the existing building framework with some external seating similar to that of Barzura next door. 	
D01661958	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I strongly object to any proposed development at the south end of Coogee beach and in particular in or near to Carr Street. My 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		grounds for objection are primarily the parking problems that already exist without any new development, and also it would spoil the community environment in this local area which houses many children, families and old people.	
D01661977	Resident Randwick	- I will not be able to park and it will ruin the feel of the south end of Coogee beach.	
D01661986	Resident Queens Park	- We do not need or want another busy Coogee Bay Road.	
D01662031	Resident Beach Street Coogee	- A small cafe might be acceptable. An extensive restaurant is not. Concerns with Traffic Issues: the large "shared" traffic zone to the east of the site of the proposal is already very dangerous. The proposed doubling of the commercial area for the benefit of this Carr Street frontage must increase the possibility of road accidents. - The crossing is used by crowds of pedestrians making their way to the children's park and to the beach. Service: How can deliveries be made to, and garbage removed from the large restaurant being proposed?	
D01662101	Resident Maroubra	- This is a Residential zone and any new development would potentially destroy the ambience, hence should be set back from the boundaries.	
D01662102	Resident Pagewood	- Site is excessive in size and completely out of character with the local environment and will create further strain on very limited parking facilities.	
D01662114	Resident Bondi Junction	- Removing the parking lot will cause street congestion and traffic problems for those trying to access Living room Yoga studio and restaurant	
D01662115	Resident Coogee	- Violence at night brought on by alcohol. Any additional cafe or restaurant should be small scale (less than 20 seats) and should close at 7pm.	
D01662117	Resident Coogee	- Adversely affect congestion in the area due to increased vehicle traffic and parking and spoil the laid-back ambience in this area.	
D01662128	Resident Coogee	- Too big and in excess of that required for a small scale cafe or restaurant. Is a Residential zone and any new development should be set back from the boundaries and this area is not set back.	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		- Don't turn Coogee into Bondi; it is already over crowded as it is.	
D01662132	Resident Coogee	- Any development would be detrimental to the area; would undermine the uniqueness of the block between Beach Street and Kurrawa Avenue and would exacerbate parking problems.	
D01663167	Resident Randwick	- Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and resultant parking and congestion problems.	
D01663172	Resident Coogee	- We already have enough cafes and restaurants in the area, the community does not need the additional noise and traffic generated by additional development in this area.	
D01663174	Resident Coogee	- I'm against the proposal as it will increase traffic & parking problems & it is out of character for that location.	
D01663178	Resident Coogee	- I wish to object to the proposal to develop another cafe/restaurant on the Windsor Towers site on Carr St, Coogee. - This proposal was rejected by Council at a meeting last year. This smells of deliberate deception of the compilers of the plan to overcome resident's views and Council's powers.	
D01663211	Resident Coogee	- Objection as a resident/family of home owner. There is already two busy cafe/restaurants in this area i.e. Barzura and Ceviche. We do not want anymore! Coogee Bay Road has ample cafe/restaurants to cater for the areas needs and is a chaotic thoroughfare because of it. - This area is a peaceful haven already experiencing traffic congestion problems. Residents deserve their current peace. The peaceful ambience is one of the key reasons my family purchased our property with a view for my parents to retire here. Please do not destroy.	
D01663247	Resident Hunters Hill	- The draft DCP: 58-64 Carr St should be abandoned. What exists today is a village ambience which has been enjoyed by people who are local and from all around the world. Any attempt to adversely alter its character, which we believe the current proposal will do, should be strongly opposed by councillors and residents. Please vote NO!	
D01663252	Resident	- This area is already congested with the surf club; playground and	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
	Maroubra	beach parking and any further retail development would just duplicate Coogee Bay Road Precinct and alienate those retailers / cafes.	
D01663256	Resident Randwick	- It is not appropriate to allow a commercial development at 58-60 Carr St Coogee in a zoned residential area. Council have reneged on their previous commitment to this particular site.	
D01663266	Resident Maroubra	- I live in Maroubra but am a frequent visitor to Coogee and particularly appreciate that the streets immediately around the southern end of the beach are zoned residential, and hence are fairly quiet compared to others areas of Coogee. - Moreover, it is generally relatively easy to find parking. Hence, I do not support any rezoning or other changes in the DCP that would allow yet more large-scale cafe and/or restaurant development in Coogee, and notably at the eastern end of Carr Street (that is, numbers 58 to 64). To my mind, such changes are completely inappropriate and out of keeping with the existing nature of this part of this lovely suburb.	
D01663272	Resident Coogee	- Coogee has more than enough restaurants, we don't need more and especially something as large as this which is so close to the beach where parking is already so difficult. - I am a local resident and expect to be able to park at my local beach for which I pay a premium in council rates and an expensive mortgage. I am tired of driving around trying to find a park as it is. How will this contribute to the local area other than to increase congestion? The other restaurants are not full!	
D01663276	Resident Coogee	- Is already so difficult to park around this area of Coogee and the footpath outside the restaurant would be equally congested. The primary purpose that people come to Coogee is to swim, to use the beach and already it is difficult to do this. Quite apart from actually finding a park, Carr Street east of Arden Street could not cope with the actual traffic let alone the parking. We do not need more cars! - There are already SO many restaurants and they are not full all the time! There is one restaurant on the north side and one on the south, and a million up the middle! Preserve what is special about	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		Coogee, we do not need more man-made problems, let's enjoy the God-given beauty of this suburb and not spoil it like so much else gets spoiled. What are you aiming for - another Bondi??	
D01663280	Resident Coogee	- As a local, I experience parking to be already difficult and this proposed development would increase parking problems, making it very very difficult for residents and local alike in this Residential Zone.	
D01663284	Resident Coogee	- This is a very quiet and peaceful area and is much used and appreciated by families and elderly residents for this reason. Please keep it this way as a haven away from the chaos of Coogee Bay Road. In addition it would create even more demand for the very limited parking available at present.	
D01663289	Visitor	- I visit Coogee often and spend time at the southern end of the bay. I do not support the development as this part of Coogee is a peaceful haven from the noise and commercialisation of the rest of the bay.	
D01663291	Resident	- As a homeowner am concerned it is too big and in excess of that required for a small scale cafe or restaurant. This is a Residential zone and any new development should be set back from the boundaries and this developable area is not set back. - It is of particular concern given the strong voice and opinion locals provided last year about any rezoning of this area.	
D01660284	Resident Coogee	So much of Coogee's village atmosphere and heritage (particularly the built environment) has been lost due to over development and the influence of developers. - Coogee is not and I hope will never be another Bondi.	
D01660291	Resident Coogee	- The commercial zoning would put more pressure on parking in this area. Deliveries to a commercial business would be difficult in this location. The size and bulk would be out of character for the area. The noise added to an already busy area would pull down the area. - I don't see any positive for this proposal and ask council to reconsider this proposal and not accept it.	
D01661753	Resident Coogee	- The Carr St proposal is too big and will cause problems in an already congested area. Car parking is at a premium already and	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>this will exacerbate it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The area is already well served with small businesses and the new items will be of no extra value to the area. 	
D01661754	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unsupportive of the proposed development for cafe's and restaurants as this will endanger the current peaceful atmosphere. - There is a great risk of destroying the key draw card of the area and turning it into rubbish filled tourist trap like Coogee Bay Road. 	
D01661756	Resident Randwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not supportive of the proposed development area at 58-60 Carr St 	
D01661757	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unsupportive of new restaurants as there are enough now. It is very hard to live in the suburb with all the parking. 	
D01661759	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to the draft DCP covering 58-60 Carr Street as the area is already crowded and the southern end of the beach is a respite from this. Council is urged not to implement this plan 	
D01660352	Resident Rosebay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the proposed development plan for a large café/restaurant as it's in conflict with the objectives set out for 58-64 Carr Street on Page 56 of C4, i.e. "protecting the amenity of nearby residents"(by adding to congestion and parking problems?); - "improves the public domain of Carr St" (by filling it up with more building?); "promote pedestrian activity and safety" (by filling up more of the footpath?) 	
D01660353	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note that "the attraction of Coogee Bay as a natural resource depends upon maintaining a low profile of buildings. The Barzura building is an asset to the site and should not be developed in any way". - Note also that this part of Coogee should not be developed into a visitor/tourist destination, with a large development on the southern foreshore. 	
D01660355	Resident Randwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the draft DCP for this site, which would cause more congestion and change the character of the area. 	
D01660356	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the proposed provisions relating to the site. Note that "The developable area for a proposed restaurant or café seems to be enormous. The Carr st frontage is twice the size of the existing Barzura café and there are no provisions to prevent the use of the 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>first floor for outdoor dining and alcohol consumption."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The remaining enclave on Coogee Bay should not be handed over for massive commercial development. A small cafe/restaurant based on existing frontage would be appropriate". The proposed DCP controls demonstrate no consideration of the amenity impacts of commercial development on neighbours, such as view loss, privacy or noise. - Enquire that if the draft DCP imposes no setback control between 58 and 62 Carr St. 	
D01660361	Resident Rozelle	- Not support the plan for 58-60 Carr St, which is much more than is required and will not enhance the area.	
D01660363	Resident Maroubra	- Not support the proposed developable area for a café or restaurant on the site. The size of the development will lead to lack of sufficient setback and more pressure on the crowded parking situation.	
D01661939	Resident Randwick	- Note that no more traffic congestion and poor parking should be brought to Coogee Bay Rd, where the situation "is already bad enough".	
D01661941	Resident Coogee	- As one of the many residents, not support another large café/restaurant in the area which will bring noise from the business itself and from the many deliveries required and garbage pick ups.	
D01661942	Resident West Lakes Shore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a visitor to the area, request that the 'Coogee Bay Rd' scenario with traffic and parking issues and an inevitable loss of quaint seaside atmosphere should not be created again on Carr Street. - Instead, support should be offered "to small businesses and sweet atmosphere already there". 	
D01661760	Resident Maroubra	- Unsupportive of the proposed developable area for a café/restaurant at 58-60 Carr St. This part of Coogee Beach is a lovely contrast to the bustle of Coogee Bay Road and should be maintained with the space and local ambience.	
D01660312	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am against development to the Randwick/Coogee area without infrastructure to support it. Existing infrastructure and parking can not handle further development. - Randwick Council needs to provide more parking, not more parking 	Note this submission raises issues which are outside the scope of the draft DCP and should be raised with the Council's customer

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>meters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Randwick council should cease to develop Coogee as it is doing a terrible job keeping current construction sites clean and efficient. I am referring to the construction site on Havelock Ave Coogee. The footpath on the side street is demolished and has been for over a year. The alleyway connecting Dudley and Havelock Ave has been closed for over a year. Why do we pay fees? - And on top of that the parking ranger for the area consistently issues fines on a Sunday for the loading zone on Havelock Ave outside the abandoned construction site. 	service centre independently. .
D01660317	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 56-80 Carr Street. As a community we put in a huge amount of time and effort to bring to Council's attention the fact that the development then proposed for this site was not welcome by the majority of us who love and protect Coogee, and the Council took an appropriate vote in May. Now - again - what is this that is being proposed? A second bite at an area that should have remained protected from unnecessary development. - Why must everything be developed to death? The death of the character, the death of the sense of community, the death of the charm that people feel? Why is it again on the table? We don't need another cafe, we don't need another commercial development of any kind. We don't need people making money at the expense of everyone else. - Please put this area to bed as it is and leave us all in peace. 	
D01660318	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We object to any change under the draft DCP which would allow for 58-64 Carr Street Coogee (the "Windsor Towers" apartment block) to be re-developed to allow commercial activities such as bars and / or restaurants and/or cafes. - Our main reasons for objection are that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the recent decision by Council to retain residential zoning was heavily supported by residents and should not be overturned and ignored. 2) any move to allow (more) commercial activities such as bars/ cafes would risk more anti-social activities, offensive behaviour, 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>late night noise and nuisance.</p> <p>3) this area is densely populated which provides its own pressure on parking</p> <p>4) such re-development would provide further pressure on parking access</p> <p>5) parking access is already strained by existing restaurants, Oceans Bar and the Surf Club bar, (with its frequent social functions).</p> <p>6) parking access already carries overflows from the beach area and the Coogee Bay Hotel.</p> <p>- For the above reasons we request Council to retain the existing residential zoning for this area.</p>	
D01660324	Resident Coogee	<p>- I thought the Carr St zoning issue was settled last year with the Council resolution to keep the area zoned residential. However, the draft DCP proposes to assess DAs for commercial uses at this eastern end of Carr St as if the zoning was NOT residential. This is not acceptable. All development proposals - commercial and residential - in a Residential zone should be assessed according to the residential controls. There are a number of concerns about the draft DCP re Carr</p> <p>- As mentioned above, although the eastern end of Carr St is zoned Residential, Council is seeking to undermine this by proposing that only residential uses should be assessed with the requirements of the Residential zoning. For commercial uses, amenity issues such as set backs, view loss etc are not well regulated.</p> <p>- The draft DCP restricts any new commercial development to a small scale cafe or restaurant BUT then, for the site at 58-60 Carr St, the DCP shows a very large developable area, much more than is required for something small scale.</p> <p>- There are enough large restaurants at this end of the bay with the Barzura, Ceviche and Banana Palm. Another large restaurant would add significantly to the noise, traffic and acute parking issues in the area.</p> <p>- This developable area for 58-60 Carr St indicates development right</p>	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		across to the Barzura adding so adding more building bulk to this foreshore protected area. This is an important issue (and precedent) and I urge you to amend the DCP accordingly.	
D01660336	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preferred Recommendations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the words "for residential purposes" from the last sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 56 and the "residential uses on site" from the first bullet point of Xviii) on page 58. 2. Reduce the size of the developable area so that is an appropriate fit for a small-scale café or restaurant and so as to comply with the side set back requirements. In doing this retain the driveway in its current form. 3. Amend Control i) to read "Proposals for restaurant or café must be limited to one floor at the ground level from Carr Street and must present an active street front to Carr Street only". 4. Reduce the hours of any small-scale café or restaurant on 58-60 Carr Street to 8pm. 	
D01661800	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I'm a resident of Coogee and wish to comment on the draft DCP Section C relating to 56-59 Carr St. Any commercial development on the site of the block of units on the corner of Carr St was meant to be small scale. - The debate in Council last May when Council voted to retain R3 residential zoning for Carr St was quite clear on this. And also the draft DCP stipulates a small scale restaurant or cafe on.56 but then contradicts this on p.59 by proposing an area right across to the Barzura and big enough for a large restaurant or cafe. - Residents do not want another large restaurant or cafe in this part of Coogee which is relatively quiet and residential. A large venue will bring noise, frequent deliveries and more garbage pick ups as well as more people (customers and staff) who will compete for parking and further add to traffic congestion. - Council should put forward an area more appropriate to a small restaurant or cafe and keep faith with the residents. 	
D01661805	Resident Maroubra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I do not support the proposed da on 58-60 Carr st, there are already parking problems and we don't want another Coogee bay 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		road which is a mess as we all know	
D01661808	Resident Coogee	- In reference to 58-64 Carr St. , this part of Carr St is zoned residential [R3] and there should be no new large scale commercial development	
D01661809	Resident Coogee	- I do not support the plans for a cafe or restaurant at 58-60 Carr st Coogee. This will ruin the ambience of beautiful Coogee!	
D01661811	Resident Randwick	- I do not support this development. Let's keep the south end of the beach un-commercialised and peaceful. It's one of the only spots in Coogee to be so.	
D01661812	Resident Maroubra	- I do not support the proposed developable area for a cafe or restaurant on the site of 58-60 Carr St. It will destroy the ambience of this lovely spot and further the already existent parking issues.	
D01661813	Resident Coogee	- 58-64 Carr Street, Coogee. Objections: The development is too large for a residential area It will bring commercial activity to a residential area It will place extra burden on parking which is already at capacity. It is inconsistent with the draft LEP about keeping the area residential	
D01661815	Resident Clovelly	- Please, please don't overload this area with large developments! Do you know how many tourists come & comment on the pleasure of this relaxed space - low rise, sparkling sea, pedestrians welcome. - The antithesis of greedy development! Once it's overdeveloped, it's gone for good!	
D01661817	Resident Maroubra	- I am opposed to the development for the site at 58-60 Carr St in Coogee. Coogee already is very congested and this south end of the beach still retains some elements of tranquillity in relation to both the businesses that are there and the natural features. - I am a rate payer in Randwick and really appreciate the natural beauty of this particular little spot. I regularly use the beach, parkland, baths and also the yoga studio and cafes there. - Any more congestion, which the proposed development will definitely bring, will really ruin the character of the space. Please register my opposition. I hope the development will not go ahead.	
D01663171	Resident Coogee	- <u>Two page submission</u> 1. Notes that the draft DCP provisions for Carr St (part 8.2 of C4) fail	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>to address the resolution of the Council on 22 May 2012 in relation to Carr St and seem designed to potentially circumvent the resolutions, by effectively allowing for significant commercial development on the sites despite their retention of a residential zoning.</p> <p>- The submission raises the following key points in relation to the site specific controls for Carr St:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The draft C4 provisions do not require any non-residential development on the sites to be assessed in accordance with the Medium Density Residential controls in the DCP relevant to R3 zoning. C4 is directly inconsistent with the clear statement in the DCP at D7:6.1 'that commercial development in residential zones must be consistent with residential controls'; ii) The developable area at 58-60 Carr Street is granted a very large developable area without explanation as to why, and is defined by a zero lot line without building setbacks, including onto Kurrawa Avenue; iii) The draft objectives and controls provide no guidance on permitted commercial uses other than cafes or restaurants which might be developed, nor do they expressly limit such other commercial development to a single floor at ground level of Carr Street; iv) 'Ground level' is not defined and, on a sloping site such as 58-60 Carr Street, is an ambiguous term which may be exploited to permit multiple level commercial development on that site beneath existing apartments. The submission requests that Council consider amending part 8.2 of C4 of the draft DCP to: make all development address the DCP controls for Medium Density Residential under the R3 zoning; and limit development on the Carr Street frontage to a single floor only at ground level appropriate for a small scale commercial business such as a small cafe or restaurant. 	
D01663180	Resident Randwick	<p>- <u>Five page submission</u></p> <p>Notes the recent amendments to the EP&A Act which have clarified</p>	General support for proposal noted but raises concern

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>the role which DCPs provide and supports the objectives to prescribe in the site specific section relating to 58-64 Carr Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes in relation to the site specific controls that they are overly prescriptive; that the controls are too detailed and reflect outcomes and conditions that are better suited to future development consents so that they respond to a specific development outcome e.g. control XII - includes a requirement for compliance with the BCA and a clause that requires 'awnings to be structurally sound and safe'. - The Draft DCP also repeats a number of matters which are more appropriately dealt with in SEPP 65 including design of balconies, setbacks, floor to ceiling heights and referrals to the Design Review Panel. The site specific conditions in the Draft DCP may conflict with these outcomes for example; requiring balconies to potentially stay below the minimum area required by SEPP 65 is contradictory. - In relation to the refurbishment and upgrade of the existing Residential Flat Building (at 58-60 Carr St), the submission notes that the clauses in the draft DCP which relate to loading, waste, awnings, hours of usage and the like are not required in the draft DCP and are matters usually dealt with in response to a DA. - The submission suggests that an 'acceptable level of control' can be limited to the current objectives and few of the more relevant requirements, namely controls i); ii); xvi); and xix). It requests that the site specific controls relating to Carr Street be revised to remove matters which are outside the framework for DCPs and are matters which are appropriately dealt with by conditions of consent. 	<p>regarding overly prescriptive site specific controls for 58-64 Carr St are noted. The site specific controls in the draft DCP reflect the resolution of the Council in May 2012. While most of the factors referenced such as 'awnings to be structurally safe' etc are matters which are usually dealt with as conditions of consent, it provides the community with the assurance that these amenity matters need to be considered and addressed as part of a development application for the site. Moreover, where there are inconsistencies with SEPP 65 and the DCP, SEPP will prevail.</p> <p>The suggestion to remove matters which are appropriately dealt with as conditions of consent are not supported, the site specific controls in the draft DCP reflect the resolution of the council in May 2012 and as mentioned, provide the community with a clear understanding of what is required to be provided and/or considered as part of any future development application for the site.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			Issues further addressed in the body of the Council report.
D01662632	Thomsons Lawyers	<p>- <u>Three page submission</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Notes that the draft DCP in relation to Carr St is inconsistent with the resolution passed in May 2012 with respect to the draft LEP that the area of Coogee is and remain residential. The reason for granting this site 'special treatment' is entirely unexplained. <p>- The submission raises the following key objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That commercial uses are not assessed against residential guidelines in the DCP. The primary and overriding consideration for any development (and hence the protection for residents) depends upon the 'zoning' of a site. The draft DCP is seeking to circumvent the zoning of the site and effectively create a 'hybrid zoning' for this particular area; 2. Exempting commercial uses from the general controls, setbacks, which are the key instrument for amenity impacts, will be ignored in the DA assessment process for these uses. The draft DCP is specific about this in relation to 58-60 Carr St in subclauses xviii) and xviv) and the image on pg.59. The regulation of setbacks in any residential area is a key to controlling much of the adverse amenity impacts residential neighbours are often confronted with through development; 3. Many houses and units in Kurrawa Avenue and Beach Street will be affected by this special treatment of this site; the lack of setbacks will restrict light and views to properties in the lower end of both streets; and the top surface of this developable area will be a large outdoor pavilion like area, surrounding residences will be subjected to the noise and cooking smells arising from this use of this area; 4. Council staff have incorrectly interpreted the resolution of the Council in May with respect to setbacks, in particular: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) this site being R3, is the legislative guarantee to residents as to which controls apply to this site; 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>b) the resolution does not mention the need for a continuous street frontage;</p> <p>c) the resolution does not mention moving the Carr Street driveway into Windsor towers;</p> <p>d) there was no need for the resolution on the LEP to actually identify what the set backs would be because those set backs would be the applicable residential set backs, given the residential zoning of the area;</p> <p>e) the resolution did not mention exempting commercial uses from the general controls for this residential area. The submission suggests that: the DCP controls pertaining to Medium Density Residential should apply to 58-64 Carr St as they do for commercial development in residential zones; the developable area identified in the DCP for 58 Carr St should be consistent with, and show the usual residential set backs, lest there be any confusion as to the appropriate extent of development for this site.</p> <p>- The submission further notes that the draft DCP states that any cafe or restaurant must be 'small scale'; however the permitted developable area is large enough to accommodate a very large one. The draft DCP is silent with respect to the impact on parking in this area. The draft DCP should expressly state that on site parking numbers should increase by reason of the associated commercial uses by reason of the extra demands on parking by staff and patrons.</p> <p>- Further, diverting the parking entrance from Carr Street to Kurrawa Avenue will also have adverse impact on the amenity of this area and create traffic hazards. The development of a 'high scale restaurant/ cafe with outdoor facilities will also morph in time to an outdoor entertainment/ club establishment.</p>	
D01661845	Resident Coogee	<p>- <u>Faxed submission</u></p> <p>- I object to the wording of the draft DCP in relation to the assessment of development for the sites comprising 58-64 Carr Street. The LEP zones this area residential, while permitting</p>	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>restaurants or cafes, subject to development consent. However, it seems to me that Council is proposing not to assess new development applications for commercial uses on these sites, most particularly 58-60 Carr St, in accordance with the Medium Density Residential controls in the DCP that pertain to the R3 zoning in the LEP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On page 56 (paragraph 4) of section c4 of the draft DCP it states 'The purpose of this section is to provide site specific controls to ensure that any development of these sites for restaurant or cafe use does not adversely impact on the residential amenity of surrounding residences'. However, this is followed on the same page with 'Development for Residential Purposes must address other relevant sections of this DCP section relating to Medium Density residential'. Why is commercial development left out? - Again on page 58 there is the statement 'Any alterations and/or refurbishment proposals at 58-60 Carr Street must address Part C section on Medium Density Residential of this DCP...' However, this is followed with 'Retain current side and rear building setbacks for residential uses on site'. Why is residential development left out again? - It would appear that it is Councils intention to exclude commercial uses in 58-64 Carr Street from the requirement to address Part C section on Medium Density Residential of this DCP? It would appear so from the comments above and the image of the developable areas for proposed restaurant or cafe shown on page 59 which is completely devoid of side setbacks which are a key residential control. - Despite the stated purpose of this section of the DCP, it would appear that Council is proposing to exclude development applications for commercial uses from having to address Part C section on Medium Density Residential of this DCP. If this is the intention then i find this totally unacceptable. Controls in the Medium Density Residential section of the DCP establish setback requirements which are one of the primary controls that affect the 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>residential amenity of surrounding residences as they bear upon view sharing, privacy issues and other amenity impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no reason given in the draft DCP for this exclusion of development for commercial purposes from the need to be assessed according to the Medium Density Residential section of the DCP. - I understand there is a Council resolution from May 2012 with regards to 58-64 Carr Street that requires there to be in the DCP 'Detailed development design guidance' on matters such as streetscape elements, design criteria for upgrades, setbacks and other related development/design criteria. However, this provides no basis for dispensing with the need to assess all development applications, whether they be for residential or commercial uses in this area zoned Residential R3, in accord with the Residential zoning controls in the DCP. I urge Council to reconsider this matter and make any and all development in 58-64 Carr Street subject to the general controls as set out in the final Medium Density Residential section of the DCP. 	
D01662331	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am writing to object to the proposal for development at 58-64 Carr St. As a long time resident of Coogee I value the balance between the busy and social, and quieter residential areas. I have lived in Beach Street for several years and enjoy the sense of peacefulness after hours. - Working late shifts in the hospital I really appreciate the evening parking on return home. The parking situation is already very pressured and I worry that further developments would mean a long, possibly dark and not entirely safe walk home. 	
D01665164	Resident Malabar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am disappointed that a development is still being proposed at 58-64 Carr St. Coogee already has a number of drinking holes and also has a poor track record in terms of alcohol related violence and death. So far the southern end of Coogee has remained relatively clear of these incidents - which I don't think will be the case if this end of the beach is further developed. - Coogee remains a place where one can still take the family, which I 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		don't think will be the case if you over develop the southern end which has surf living and a kids park which is still a safe place to take children.	
D01665895	Resident Randwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The south end of Coogee beach at Carr street is by far the most pleasant and functions well with good ambience (somewhere I am proud to bring my overseas visitor). Why change something that works when the rest of Coogee beach development is so ugly and poorly designed. - Any new development should keep to the existing boundaries and not jeopardise precious car parking spots. 	
D01657360	Resident Wollongong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likes the quiet low key atmosphere at the southern end of the bay. - Concern about the large developable area, seems inconsistent with the DCP and a significant over development. This site is only suited to a small cafe of 20-30 patrons, not a large restaurant. - Coogee is already way too congested with traffic and parking is almost impossible. - Another large restaurant (or cafe) in this residential area will make it worse for everyone as a result of numerous deliveries, more noise, more garbage collection, parking rage and traffic stress etc. - The commercial area should be reduced accordingly and be limited to the front of the building. 	
D01657362	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oppose what is planned for 58- 64 Carr St. This eastern end of Carr St is zoned residential in the new LEP. However the draft DCP exempts commercial use from complying with residential zoning. This is not acceptable and is of considerable concern for many reasons. - Also the draft DCP shows the block at 58-60 Carr St with a large area designated as developable for a restaurant or cafe. I understand that this was to be for a small scale cafe or restaurant not a large one. - I do not support any more large commercial activity at the southern end of the bay. If any commercial activity is to occur on this site it should be limited to under the building or in the garden area in the front and be for a small cafe or restaurant of 20 or so patrons as is 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		the case elsewhere in Coogee.	
D01657364	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am disappointed to see that after a Council vote to keep 58-60 Carr St zoned residential with an allowance for a small cafe or restaurant underneath, we are seeing allowance for a very large commercial operation. - By using different definitions of "small" to pave the way for what is in fact a "large" operation is deceptive. This diminishes any sense of trust the community can feel. If Council staffs have a different definition of the word small then it should have been clearly defined at the onset. 	
D01658334	Resident Randwick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The LEP designates this area as being zoned residential. Therefore new development related to all uses should be assessed subject to the Medium Density section of the DCP, not just the residential uses. - If the commercial uses are not so assessed there is no protection afforded neighbours or the neighbourhood with respect to amenity impacts. In particular there are controls for set backs in the Medium Density C4 section. These should apply to the foreshadowed commercial development at 58-60 Carr St. 	
D01658337	Resident Kensington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I live in Randwick City Council and enjoy spending time at the Southern part of Coogee Beach. Please do not go ahead with the large development proposed for 58-60 Carr as outlined in the draft DCP. 	
D01658342	Resident Matraville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many of my friends around Coogee have raised concerns regarding the draft DCP I support them and hope that Council also does the same and oppose the proposal to permit a large scale restaurant or cafe at 58 Carr St. This is not what Council resolved in 2012. 	
D01658346	Resident Matraville	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I support my husband and his friends and oppose the proposal outlined in the draft DCP to permit a large scale restaurant or cafe at 58 Carr St. This is not what Council resolved in 2012. 	
D01658350	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please keep CARR st zoned residential as promised. 	
D01661974	Resident South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to development at 58-60 Carr Street Coogee. Area is zoned residential and commercial development should be assessed 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
	Coogee	<p>under residential zoning controls. The proposed café/restaurant is large scale not small and not in best interests of Coogee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Council should not treat this as a special case without having to meet basic/standard controls. - Another restaurant would add to existing parking, noise and traffic in the area. - Proposal will add to building bulk. - Parking is already and issue- existing block (58-60 Carr St) does not have sufficient parking for its residents so where will staff and patrons park. - Do not want the area to be another tourist destination. 	
D01662133	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commercial development at 58-64 Carr Street should not be exempted from assessment under residential controls in the DCP. - DA assessment will ignore amenity impacts on neighbours, privacy, views, peace and quiet and other controls in the DCP. Setbacks is a key criteria and will be ignored. Cafe and restaurant uses are inconsistent with aims of the draft DCP in relation to R3 zoning. - Setback requirements not mentioned in Council resolution and removes the development from assessment in relation to amenity impacts should not be applied flexibly. - Reference in draft DCP to "small scale" is inconsistent with image on page 59 which shows large-scale cafe/restaurant. From FOI request internal capacity of 100 patrons. Small scale premises are 10-25 patrons. A 9m frontage for ground floor would be small scale. Closing time of 10am is not in keeping with small-scale. Should close 8pm. 	
D01660367	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that Council is considering another large development this end of Carr St. Coogee is already overdeveloped and too many restaurants; not enough parking in area; - Coogee does not need another source of noise and bright lights, vehicles, rubbish; area should not become like Bondi. 	
D01660372	Resident Darlinghurst	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed developable area for a cafe or restaurant not supported. It is too big and not a small scale café/restaurant. This is a Residential zone and any new development should be set back from 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		the boundaries and this developable area is not set back.	
D01661820	Resident Coogee	- Objects to proposed developable area for a cafe or restaurant on the site of 58-60 Carr St, which will alter the character of the South end of Coogee Beach. Will extend Coogee Bay Road bringing congestion, parking problems, overfilled footpath and a general destruction of the local ambience.	
D01661824	Resident Coogee	- This will definitely destroy the ambience of an already perfect area and will create further parking problems.	
D01661827	Resident Woollahra	- Objection to DCP provisions for 58-64 Carr St Coogee. I do not live in the area but visit frequently. Parking is a huge problem. If there is a function on at the surf club I've had to park more than 2 blocks away. This is a wonderful peaceful part of Coogee, it would be a real shame to destroy it.	
D01661835	Resident Coogee	- This eastern end of street is a buffer from noise and pressure of the Bay with pubs, bars, clubs etc. Another large restaurant is one too many and threatens this buffer. Large restaurant not wanted. Small café is acceptable in this residential area.	
D01661912	Resident Coogee	- Not enough parking in the area	
D01660365	Resident Coogee	- Beach Street does not have adequate parking; Council should not disregard usual restrictions applying to residential development; - Restaurant will have capacity for 100 guests.	
D01661885	Resident Coogee	- Objects to development at 58-60 Carr St; will make parking more difficult; and ruin ambience of beach.	
D01661883	Resident Coogee	- Object to the development proposal at 58-60 Carr Street as this is a residential area and will lead to more parking and noise problems.	
D01661880	Resident Coogee	- Does not support proposal at 58-60 Carr St as it is clearly overdevelopment as it will require elimination of existing on site parking with more parking issues for the street; proposal is squeezing more commercial area without infrastructure to cope with increased density. Should not be approved.	
D01661851	Resident Coogee	- Very opposed to the Carr St development.	
D01661848	Resident	- Proposal will have huge impact on ambience of south side of beach;	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
	Coogee	parking already out of control; development will turn this area into another busy area and loose relaxing appeal.	
D01661847	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elected Council should uphold standards and allow residents to park near their homes; residential zoning and site should not get priority over majority; - there is too much overdevelopment; reject proposal. 	
D01661910	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to another business in this part of Coogee; parking will get worse; - Disappointed that Council should consider another business in a residential area. 	
D01661910	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to the large area proposed to be developed as a 'small café; developable area is not small but larger than Barzura next door in terms of seating; - Barzura has responsible management without loud music and anti social behaviour and clean footpath; how will loud music be managed currently the problem along Coogee Bay Road and noise from there can be heard in residential areas; noise also from people leaving late night premises; how will litter be managed?; - Problems will arise from people leaving premises at night; 10pm closing time 7 days/week is essential; small cafe or restaurant may be warranted; - Managers should be responsible and considerate of neighbours; other noise sources like air conditioning, deliver and garbage collection and movement of traffic; - Parking problems; - We don't need more eateries. 	
D01660314	Resident Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I live in Havelock Ave. 58-64 Carr St is zoned residential. Small café may be ok, but outline looks like a large restaurant/café. -There is no parking, where will delivery vans park? Urge council to reject the application. 	
D01663145	Residents Cairo Street, South Coogee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am disturbed, angry and saddened by the prospect of more overdevelopment in 58-60 Carr Street. Council resolution on 22 May 2012 allowed for a small scale café or restaurant. - The developable area as proposed is enormous and without 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>setbacks, creating a big, bulky and monolithic built form in the foreshore protection area. This type of development does not satisfy the objectives or controls for the foreshore scenic protection area. The FSPA is not referenced in the Medium Density Residential or Commercial sections of the DCP, despite applying to parts of Coogee and this omission needs to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific controls need to be included in all zones to minimise the impact of new development on the shoreline. Huge entertainment facilities on the foreshore are not desirable. - What residents want is for residential controls to apply to all development in a residential area. It appears the draft DCP is proposing that only residential uses are subject to such controls in 58-60 Carr Street and exempts commercial uses from them. Neighbouring residents will have no protection relating to amenity issues such as privacy, noise, view loss, overshadowing, lack of parking, increased traffic congestion, garbage collection etc. - The Neighbourhood Centres – General Controls section states “Corner neighbourhood shops and limited business uses are permissible in residential zones. RLEP also has a clause allowing the retention and continued use of existing purpose built commercial premises. It should be noted that development should be consistent with the controls stipulated in either the Low Density Residential or Medium Density Residential sections of the DCP.” - Following on from this it seems that Medium Density Residential Controls should be applied for all development in this R3 zone. If so, the developable area must be reduced and setbacks must be honoured and enforced and neighbouring properties amenity be protected. - Coogee has enough entertainment establishments. Residents do not want more high impact drinking establishments nor even any more late night bars. - Parking is inadequate, garbage overflows, infrastructure generally can't cope. The site in question doesn't even have sufficient parking for its existing residents so how would it cope with additional staff, 	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		garbage and patron requirements – instead it would become the issue for the local streets which are already full to the brim. - Should the needs of the owners of one building be given priority over all other neighbouring residents? A small café or restaurant would be appropriate if it satisfies the R3 Medium Density Residential controls ensuring that setbacks, FSR, height, scale, hours of operation etc. are all consistent with the residential zoning; Limits non-residential uses to one ground floor level only; Has its primary street frontage on Carr Street; Limits outdoor dining to Carr Street only; Provides adequate off street parking for staff and patrons; Does not adversely affect residential amenity; Enhances the pedestrian environment without endangering safety and access; Can ensure the infrastructure exists to cope with yet another commercial business for e.g. deliveries, waste collection etc.	
D01663277	Resident Randwick	- Do not agree with proposal for another restaurant/café in 58-60 Carr St. Will only make the place uninviting and crowded. Some restaurants/cafes in Coogee are already struggling to keep businesses afloat.	
D01663259	Resident Coogee	- No need to be commercial (no further detail provided - assumed to be about Carr St).	
Form letter submissions			
D01662121	Four submissions, residents from Coogee	<u>Form letter submission 1</u> - Development too big and in excess of that required for a small scale cafe or restaurant. - Is a Residential zone and any new development should be set back from the boundaries; this area not set back.	
D01663268	Additional submission based on form letter above with additional input	- It is too big and in excess of that required for a small scale cafe or restaurant. This is a Residential zone and any new development should be set back from the boundaries and this developable area is not set back. - As a local who treasures the few spaces that are pedestrian friendly due to development restrictions, I implore you to reconsider.	

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01661930	Eleven submissions -residents from Coogee, Clovelly and Matraville	<u>Form letter submission 2</u> - "Do not support the proposed developable area for a cafe or restaurant on the site of 58-60 Carr St. It is too big and in excess of that required for a small scale cafe or restaurant. - This is a Residential zone and any new development should be set back from the boundaries and this developable area is not set back."	