
Sent: 25/06/2020 7:28:59 PM
Subject: DA2020/0512 OBJECTION
Attachments: DA2020 0512 Objection 200625.pdf;

Good evening Mr Collier,

Please see attached letter of objection to the proposed development at 532 Pittwater Road North Manly.

I would appreciate it if our submission is considered carefully and in the interests of the existing stakeholders many of whom are long term residents and owners of properties in the section bordered by Hope Avenue, corrie road and Pittwater Road.

Kind regards,

Kind Regards,

Randall Lumbewe
Director and Chairman



Tel: +61294309888 | Mob: +61418293743



SYNETICOM
LanTro Vision Global Alliance Partner
50 Balgowlah Road, Balgowlah
NSW2093 Australia

LEARN, THINK, GROW, CONNECT.

Audio Visual • Data Centre • Electrical Services • Structured Cabling
ICN • Layer 3 Networking • Cloud Unified Comms • Remote Hands

Reference: Development Application No: DA2020/0512 pertaining to Lot 40 DP7027, 532 Pittwater Road North Manly

Dear Tony,

As residents and property owners of 9 Hope Avenue North Manly, we have received the notification letter regarding the proposed development to the property at 532 Pittwater Road, North Manly which is less than 75 metres South West of our property.

We purchased in this neighbourhood 33 years ago and did so because of the general amenity of the area, leafy, quiet, well established, low density housing with long term residents, which to us demonstrated stability in the neighbourhood and therefore offering a level of relative safety and security. We



chose this area over and above other suburbs on the Northern Beaches due to this **low-density housing** and did so over and above choosing to purchase in Queenscliff, Freshwater (nee Harbord) or Dee Why. And I have to say that over the 33 years, the general trend has followed on our initial pre-purchase expectations where the residents are still long termers.

Of recent we know the council has approved the development of some higher density living (example: 510/512 Pittwater road, 5/5A & 9 Corrie Rd) not to mention the number of “granny flats” that seem to be popping up around the general area. These approvals have given rise to saturation car parking in the area at the very least, let alone some of the services the council are now unable to facilitate due to the number of cars parked day or night, such as clearing of the street’s gutters of leaf mulch.

I have reviewed the DA submission **DA2020/0512**, and accordingly, I wish to make a very strong objection to the proposed development at 532 Pittwater Road, on the grounds of the following:

1. Parking and Traffic

DA2020/0512 (herein referred to as the DA) shows that there are to be up to twenty four (24) residents to occupy these premises across the twelve apartments and a total of only eight car parking spaces provided for off street parking. Given the existing limitations of car parking that already exists in Hope Avenue and the lower part of Corrie Road this will potentially result in more parking congestion and traffic in and around Hope Avenue/Corrie Road/Pittwater Road.

To illustrate the problem that our community would be facing is that two of the surrounding roads (Corrie and Hope Ave) to the proposed development site, I table a summary of each addresses and the observed number of vehicles that each resident to these premises has and whether they are on or off street parked – see table below.

The table does not represent any parking numbers for visitors or emergency services and neglects to account for the almost too regular parking of non-resident trailers/boats Pantech trucks. There are at least 32 vehicles that can be parked on street at any one time. Parking for Tradies vehicles is at a premium during most days.

The area cannot sustain the likely increase in parking in the area without significantly affecting the general amenity of the neighbourhood and removing one of the good reasons why we purchased here in the first instance.

Item	Number	Street in North Manly	Number of Vehicles	Parked on Hope Avenue	Comments on Car Parking
1	540	Pittwater Road	1	0	Uses their offstreet car port
2	536	Pittwater Road	4 or more	4	There are any number of residents here given they are an Air BnB and there are three businesses run out of the premises as well
3	536A	Pittwater Road	2	2	Granny flat with at least 2 vehicles
4	534	Pittwater Road	1	0	Uses their driveway off street
5	2	Hope Avenue	1	0	Uses off street car port
6	2A	Hope Avenue	1	0	Not certain
7	4	Hope Avenue	8	3	three vehicles need to be on street the reast are generally off street
8	6	Hope Avenue	2	0	Use of their garage
9	8	Hope Avenue	2	1	one vehicle is in the parked on street
10	10	Hope Avenue	1	0	generally the vehicle is in the off street car port
11	12	Hope Avenue	2	0	off street parking
12	14	Hope Avenue	2	1	one vehicle is on street parked - 2nd vehicle is parked in Montague Street
13	16a	Hope Avenue	2	0	Generally the vehicles are off street in garages or driveway
14	16	Hope Avenue	2	0	Generally the vehicles are off street in garages or driveway
15	18	Hope Avenue	3	2	One is parked on street
16	20	Hope Avenue	2	1	One is parked on street
17	1	Hope Avenue	3	3	All parked on street
18	1A	Hope Avenue	2	2	Tenant parking on street
19	3	Hope Avenue	2	1	both parked on street
20	5	Hope Avenue	2	1	one parked on street
21	7	Hope Avenue	2	1	one parked on street
22	9	Hope Avenue	4	1	one parked on street
23	11	Hope Avenue	1	0	Parked in garage
24	512	Pittwater Road	?	2	Apartments with underground parking however often the tenants use Hope Avenue - obviously insufficient underground space available
25	5	Corrie Road		?	Town Houses with limited off street parking - spillover on Corrie Road and some congestion occurs with vehicles doing a U-turn at their driveway to go to the BP Service Station (because there is no U-Turn at the intersection)
26	5A				
27	7		2		
28	9		?		
29	9A		?		
30	9C		?		
31	11		1		
32	13	Corrie Road	1		
33	15	Corrie Road	3	1	Use Hope Avenue when there is insufficient space on Corrie Road or when their old classic cars are unable to park on the slope of Corrie Road
34	17	Corrie Road	2	1	Use Hope Avenue for when insufficient space on Corrie Road
35	19	Corrie Road	2	2	Usually have at least 2 cars parked on Hope Avenue as a result of limited space on Corrie Road
36	21	Corrie Road	1	0	
37	23	Corrie Road	1	0	
38	8A	Corrie Road	2	2	No Parking on Corrie Rd so they need to park on Hope Avenue
39	2	Corrie Road	2		Parking for granny flat tenant on street
40	4	Corrie Road	1		Parking on street
41	6	Corrie Road	3		No parking on street+A11A1:F42

Additionally, the proposed site construction at 532 Pittwater road is directly adjacent to a preschool which has numerous parents and staff requiring parking. Since the inception of the pre-school we do see more traffic in Hope Avenue which is a relatively narrow street (insufficient space for two vehicles to pass one another when there are cars parked on both sides) with parking permitted on both sides of the street. I can envisage the convenience of parking vehicles for the short-term residents to the proposed development to take advantage of parking on the Western side of Pittwater Road between Hope Avenue and corrie Road creating significant traffic congestion at peak hours.

2. Development not in keeping with surrounding premises or for-use.

- a. A boarding house is a business and the zoning of our area should not permit the proposed development on the basis it is **conducting a business**. I note that there is a caretaker apartment allowed for as well, and this is obviously for the purposes of being able to conduct the administrative tasks necessary for the accommodation being considered – i.e. to run the business. I guess I question how different is the proposed boarding house whether it be to operate a twelve-room brothel in same said premises and would the council have enabled this DA to get this far?

- b. I note in the Statement of Environment Effects (herein referred to a SEE) that there is reference to premises at both 428 and 434 Pittwater Road (Page 4 of SEE) which are supposed to be similar to that proposed in the DA. In the aerial photograph to the right, you will also note that



- the two examples provided, are arguably more in keeping with the surrounding buildings in terms of bulk and scale whereas the proposed development at No 532 Pittwater road has completely different surrounding buildings and is residential with the exception of the Preschool at No 530 Pittwater Road and the proposed development is NOT in the form or keeping of surrounding dwellings bordered by Hope Avenue and northern side of Corrie Road.
- c. It is my understanding that there are specific objectives in the State Environment Planning Policy, one of which is "In order to take account of issues relating to the compatibility of such proposals with the area in which they are proposed it is an essential requirement that a site compatibility certificate be obtained from the Director-General of Planning and Infrastructure certifying that the site is appropriate for this type of development before a development application can be lodged with the relevant council." I note in the SEE under section 4.2.1 item 1 that **"it is considered the design satisfies the compatibility test of the SEPP but there is no reference to the fact that there has been a Compatibility Certificate issued from the Director-General.**
- d. In section 4.2.1 of the SEE it states:

The scale of the proposed boarding house is consistent with the planned character of the area. The proposal complies with the permissible LEP building height and ARHSEPP FSR controls while the resulting scale of the building adopts a built form and siting arrangement that is congruent with that observed within the sites defining context.

14 | Page

Which is presumptuous of the author of the SEE to understand the thoughts of the owners of the neighbouring premises and the building bulk and form is so different to the dwellings of the surrounding neighbourhood I feel the Council should also give due consideration to rejecting this proposed development.

3. Itinerant occupation in a facility immediately next door to the Preschool

I do have concerns that with the somewhat itinerant occupation of the boarding house being adjacent to a Preschool that it would not be in the interests of the council to approve such a development given the sensitivity that rightly exists for the screening of boarding house guests who could have or get access to children who attend the preschool/day-care facility.

4. Precedence

I do have concerns where approval might be provided by council for this type of development at this address as per the DA, which will lead to setting the precedence and other boarding houses will follow suit. Over the 33 years I have lived in Hope Avenue I feel I have got to know many of the residents who are generally the owners, all of whom have a level of pride of their property and deserve the right to uphold the general amenity of the area thereby ensuring the value of the properties do not diminish as a result of the development in question.

Conclusion:

Given the impact which the Development proposed in the DA on the immediate area bordering Hope Avenue, Corrie and Pittwater Roads, relating to:

- i. the increased vehicular traffic
- ii. existing vehicle parking saturation
- iii. a development which is a disguised business operation
- iv. a development which is not in keeping in terms of bulk and scale with the immediate surroundings,
- v. a Development which requires a Director General Compatibility Certificate which clearly has been neglected for inclusion in the SEE
- vi. a development which exposes the children who attend the preschool immediately adjacent to the planned development to a rather itinerant set of boarders
- vii. dangerous precedence being set to create a domino effect leading to more similar developments and creating a devaluation of the neighbouring properties

I very strongly object to the development proposal for any boarding house to be established in this area. The suburb was never one considered as one for "affordable housing" in particular over the last 15 years or so at least. Perhaps this is more in keeping for some addresses in Brookvale, or Dee Why or Cromer to name just a few.

I therefore urge Council to reject this proposed development and give due consideration to feelings and thoughts of the existing voting rate payers.

Yours sincerely,

Randall Lumbewe



Lidwina Lumbewe



9 Hope Avenue North Manly

Telephone: 0418 293 743

Email: Randall@syndeticom.com.au

Lidwina.lumbewe@Syndeticom.com.au

