

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18/01/2023 2:37:50 PM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: DA2022/2181 Development Application Submission  
**Attachments:** 69 Melwood.docx;

Please find Application Submission for 69 Melwood Ave, Forestville  
DA2022/2181

Regards  
Tim

---

Email sent using Optus Webmail

Subject: DA2022/2181

69 Melwood Ave, Forestville

Dear Sir/Madam

We are writing to object to the proposed 7 Unit Senior Housing Development at 69 Melwood Ave, Forestville (DA 2022/2181).

As Forestville residents and owners of 67 Melwood Ave since 1996, it angers us to see the development planned for 69 Melwood Ave Forestville. Not only is the planning development totally out of 'character' for the suburb, it is an absolute eye-sore that will leave a permanent scar on this beautiful 'bush' suburb of residential homes, gardens, parks and trees; a suburb for people who actively **CHOOSE** space, quiet, low-density living, and a respect for our natural environment.

Following advice from a town planning consultant, we would argue the Senior Housing Development proposal should be rejected by council on the following grounds:

1: The proposal is a medium density-built form outcome in a **low-density residential area**. The proposed development is not a "low-scale" dwelling. The applicant does not provide any analysis or evidence to show that the specific characteristics of the proposed design is compatible with the local area. The character of the local area is that of single and 2-storey dwellings on landscaped blocks of land, typically with large rear yards, **NOT A FOUR STOREY COMMERCIAL MONSTROSITY!**

2: The creation of 7 apartments on one suburban block represents a significant overdevelopment of the site, as to both the bulk and design. We wonder how this could be consistent with the current R2 zoning of the neighbourhood. The expected population density from a single residential block in a R2 zone, would typically be one or even 2 x families (in a dual occupancy type development). The resulting "low density" population outcome would be perhaps up to 10 people. The density of the proposed use could result in up to 38 people residing at the site. This intensity of use is out of character with the low-density residential environment of the site. Furthermore, the very fact that the proposal fails to achieve the minimum landscape area requirements under Council's DCP control for the zone suggests the proposal is "out of character" with the area.

3: The proposal fails to achieve Council's minimum landscape area requirements, but the applicant provides no justification for the variation to the control. The minimum landscaped area as required under Council's DCP for a development in this low density setting is 40% of the site area. As a result, the minimum landscaped area, in order to be in harmony with the character of the local area, is 568.4m<sup>2</sup>. The applicant states that there is 512m<sup>2</sup> landscaped area proposed (based on the GFA of 909m<sup>2</sup> - **a shortfall of 56.4m<sup>2</sup>**). While not providing an adequate justification for the non-compliance, there is also no analysis provided of which areas comply with the definition of "landscaped area" under the WLEP (i.e. the part of a site used for growing plants, grasses and trees, but does not include any building, structure or hard paved area). The actual landscaped area figure may be further reduced. Given that there is no FSR requirement under Council's controls, and the ARH SEPP relies on FSR to guide the density and scale of buildings, it is important that the application then achieves the minimum requirements of other Council controls, such as landscaped area in order to achieve consistency with the character of the area and the density (built form and population) expected from the R2 zone

3: The design of the building is chaotic through the proposed use of many different materials in the facade, the different tiers of accommodation and the different window elements. There is no harmony in the design of the building, which is totally inconsistent with the character of the area.

4: The proposed building is 4 stories high which creates serious shading issues for both 67 and 71 Melwood Avenue. The proposed building entirely blocks any afternoon sun coming through the front of 69 Melwood and hitting our pool and garden, leaving our backyard dark and gloomy.

4: The height of a 4 story building creates serious privacy issues for 67 and 71 Melwood Avenue, particularly from the massive top floor balcony which overlooks our rear garden and pool directly from a great height. This is an absolute invasion of privacy that no fence or foliage can prevent.

5: The proposed 13 space car-park creates noise and air pollution issues, particularly to 71 Melwood Avenue who face the prospect of constant traffic up and down their driveway. Amongst the numerous refusal recommendations from various departments the "environmental Health referral response - industrial use" has highlighted the light spill from cars exiting the below ground car park that will illuminate 71 Melwood. This is entirely unacceptable. In addition to all of the above, the car parking is not typical of the character of low-density residential areas.

6: The addition of 13 cars entering and exiting Melwood Avenue would also exacerbate the traffic congestion that already exists on Melwood Avenue, particularly on Saturdays, and Monday , Wednesday and Friday nights due to oval use across the road. It's also important to note that the stretch of road between 63 and 73 Melwood Ave is double yellow lines so parking is not allowed outside 69 Melwood Avenue AT ALL, 24/7. This leaves visitors with no option but to park further along Melwood Avenue, further contributing to congestion.

6: We object to the location of the bin area in the North Western corner, right up next to our boundary fence for the following reasons: a) The noise emanating from tenants accessing the bins, disposing their rubbish and slamming of lids at all hours particularly in the evening after dinner. b) The noise as 14+ bins are dragged out of the area and onto the street for council pick up. c) Our front bedroom is that of a child and the noises from the waste area will cause disruption to his sleep and study. d) The smell from the bins due to overflow which is always a reality when so many individuals inhabit a single building. e) Also, the required Waste Management objective "To minimize any adverse environmental impacts associated with the storage and collection of waste" is not met. On the designated council bin pick up day, 14+ bins will be placed along Melwood Avenue for pick up.

8: The paling fence proposed for all boundaries is cheap and ugly as opposed to a Colorbond fence. The lifespan of these fences is limited and it will force us to go 50/50 for a new fence within a few years.

9: Excavating the ground beneath 69 Melwood Avenue for the ground floor level is risky as an underground spring exists in this area that leads to Bates Creek between Darley St and Starkey St. This excavation work will adversely affect neighbouring properties

10: There is no acoustic information or assessment (for example location of air conditioning units and noise from air-conditioning plant) needed for a development of this magnitude and impact on neighbours)

11: No Plan of Management submitted. How will the site be managed? What are the complaints handling procedures? Maintenance of the site and landscaped areas? Rules for occupants? Ownership rules etc.

12: The proposal offers sub-standard accommodation to future residents with east facing units on lower ground floor. These units will be dug into the cold ground and get minimal sunlight.

10: The period of time to construct such a complex way exceeds the reasonable time needed to construct one or two residential dwellings on the block. It is unreasonable for homeowners such as ourselves to be forced to endure an estimated 2-3 years of chaos, noise, filth and construction.

In short, it would set a dreadful precedent for Forestville if this monstrous medium-rise development in our beautiful low-level residential area was approved. We urge council to refuse this non-compliant proposal.

Yours Sincerely

Tim Arrowsmith and Catherine Edwards

67 Melwood Ave

Forestville