
Sent: 10/05/2021 3:50:35 PM
Subject: Online Submission

10/05/2021

MR Graham Johnson
12 John ST
Avalon Beach NSW 2107
gjjqantas@gmail.com

RE: DA2021/0420 - 12 A John Street AVALON BEACH NSW 2107

12A John Street DA objections

There is no new reason why a subdivision should be acceptable when the previous application was not.

We require notification of any changes to this submission at anytime.

The neighbourhood is already impacted by the significant development of Avalon House. We request an on-site meeting with a council representative to show the safety concerns, existing and future; noise, traffic and privacy issues.

Our objections relate to;

Safety and access,
Above ground power,
Blocks below minimum width,
The riparian zone impact,
Overdevelopment,
Road Traffic congestion,
Loss of value, and
Conflicting information.

Above ground power,

Above ground power supply recommended in Cardno Estuarine Risk Management report (ref NM30076/L001:PDT page 4) will be unsightly and poses safety issues.

Safety and access,

Greatest safety concern is the lack of safe access for pedestrians along John St and to the properties of 12 and 12A John St.

My elderly mother uses the driveway for exercise and access to her garage parking. We have already had the Architect for 12A John St and various visitors to 12A John Street drive onto her courtyard using it as a turning circle. This is dangerous and not in accordance with the existing rights of way.

The building/construction work for anything more than a single dwelling is unsafe and

excessive use of the driveway. To live with the long term right of way for more than one or two cars in the future is untenable and unsafe.

My daughter and her friends use the driveway to safely ride skateboards, play handball and basketball and other games.

As the car park entrance and loading dock for Avalon House is directly adjacent to our driveway there is already a very high traffic flow in and out of this zone.

Turning area for cars at the 12A end of our driveway is insufficient creating a dangerous need for backing in/ out of a very long and much used driveway. The elderly residents of Avalon House are often taken on walks by the nursing staff along John Street. Additionally, John Street is a popular walking route for young families between North Avalon and Careel Bay. An excess of cars accessing 12A John St and parking in an already busy street would pose a significant safety issue for all in the area. Additionally, there is no footpath roadside at 12 John Street or opposite forcing people to walk on the road.

The proposed overdevelopment of two below minimum width lots further adds to safety concerns of vehicles not following expected behaviours.

John St provides an access thoroughfare for many residents to access Hitchcock football, cricket, tennis, Barrenjoey High, bus stops as well as the Careel Bay dog park and soccer fields. This pedestrian, push bike and skateboard flow of residents are forced between parked cars, delivery, garbage trucks and visitors/ workers vehicles to Avalon House and other neighbours. To have more vehicles from the proposed overdevelopment increases the significant danger that extra cars/trucks reversing onto John St poses. This pedestrian, push bike and skateboard flow of residents are forced between parked cars, delivery, garbage trucks and visitors/workers vehicles to Avalon House and other neighbours. To have more vehicles from the proposed overdevelopment increases the significant danger that extra cars/trucks reversing onto John St poses.

A traffic assessment of the already overcrowded flow onto Barrenjoey Rd has not been addressed. There are only three exit roads for the entire area west of Barrenjoey Rd. Due to area overcrowding, it can take up to 15 minutes at any time of the day to exit onto Barrenjoey Rd from Kevin Ave, Wollstonecraft Ave or George Street.

Blocks below minimum width,

The proposed below minimum width blocks force future buildings to be too close to boundaries. Minimising light and forcing inadequate revegetation proposals.

The proposed width reductions will result in unacceptable height and privacy issues with our open living and sleeping areas.

The proposal to subdivide 12A John St still does not comply with minimum lot widths, the same reasons the previous submission DA2019/1332, 1333 and 1334, dated November 2019, were recommended to be withdrawn. Nor does the current application fully address that future dwellings will not encroach on the sensitive coastal environment and comply with setback regulations. The longer than required lot lengths does not adequately compensate for the unacceptably narrow lot widths as the flood levels drive any construction to be higher and towards neighbouring boundaries.

The riparian zone impact,

Biodiversity development assessment report.

Executive summary, Results dot point 6 and 7

The separate Riparian plan discusses the denuding and loss of habitats however, this is open to change and therefore irreparable loss of existing habitat can occur.

The proposal to avoid making the required payment to the Biodiversity Trust Fund (BCT) and instead submit a separate coastal riparian plan is avoiding regulatory responsibilities and leaves this clause open to change in future submissions. Irrespective, the effects on the local flora and fauna area would not recover for at least 20 years. Dividing the 12A land into two lots further complicates and reduces any ability of a genuine attempt to revegetate this fragile ecosystem.

For example the owner of 12A John St was approached as to why he cut out a very large *Duranta erecta* which was providing effective screening of their block and Avalon Nursing home. His response was "he thought it was a weed". This exhibits either a lack of understanding or a complete lack of consideration to existing vegetation or any future planting plan.

Further planning to reduce future development impact was about planning Minister Rob Stokes addressing urban heating. Dr Pfautch was quoted as saying "there should be tighter regulations around the proportion of their block private landowners could build on" to minimise global heating. (Sydney Morning Herald, December, 1, 2020) Additionally, the northern beaches council Tree canopy plan, specialist advice and state governments funding indicate we need to do more to minimise our impact. The overdevelopment proposed by 12A John St subdivision is evidence the developer does not support Local opinion, Council and state governments efforts to minimise impacts on local lifestyle, fragile diminishing riparian areas and the global climate issues. This DA is in direct conflict with current policies without immediate plans to negate, minimise or even address such issues.

Overdevelopment

The area is already overdeveloped, any subdivision will irreversibly create overcrowding. A single dwelling on the existing block is within reason and somewhat addresses a balance between providing dwellings and the environmental impact.

Conflicting information.

The Vaughan Milligan report Statement of Environmental Effects Page 10 para 5.0 proposed development, states the "existing driveway, layback and crossing will be retained in its current location." However, the THW Architects drawing, see Plans Master Set page one, indicate the proposed removal of existing kerb and guttering along the driveway. They propose to widen the driveway (to right up against boundary fence) removing the existing garden bed and screening. Off note, all services to 12A John St are situated under that existing north western garden bed. Also the Kerb and guttering is in place for drainage and as a safety barrier edge.

The original subdivision of 12 John St included the installation of the current driveway, drainage systems, and a screening garden. This proposal would overturn a council approved submission, and remove existing established plants and privacy.

Widening of the driveway still does not provide safe adequate pedestrian access.

The drawing submitted by Barrenjoey consulting engineers is not clear.

Conclusion

The previous application was unsuitable to council and neighbours.

The current submission DA2021/0420 still does not address the issues that would make a subdivision acceptable. The removal of dwellings that were part of the initial application, indicates a two stage process to gain approval for what was an unacceptable DA before. The DA would lead to overdevelopment of an already protected and fragile ecosystem, this is unacceptable.