Sent: Subject: 1/12/2020 3:51:56 AM Online Submission

01/12/2020

MR David Perks 1 Worrobil ST North Balgowlah NSW 2093 david@cloudfixers.com

RE: DA2020/1397 - 16 Bangaroo Street NORTH BALGOWLAH NSW 2093

I'd like to put forward my objections to the proposed development at 16 Bangaroo Street, North Balgowlah.

The proposal neither satisfies the planning controls nor is it a suitable purpose for the property being that it is designed as a family residence adjacent to other family residences. it is not designed as a child care centre hence has struggled and failed to meet the criteria for such.

Unless you already owned this property, it would be unimaginable to consider it to be the best (or even a good) location from which to operate a child care business for 24 children and 3 staff because :-

1. The proposal fails to meet parking requirements.

2. The proposal is on the limit of permissible noise levels even considering the proposed 3m tall noise abatement provisions.

3. The proposal does not ensure that low density residential environments are characterised by landscaped settings that are in harmony with the natural environment of Warringah given

- the removal of nature strip and loss of 1 street parking space to create a double crossover - the erection of obtrusive sound barriers,

- the concreting and installation of a parking lot in a streetscape of lush green gardens

- The removal of mature trees

- The replacement of greenscape with hardscape and astroturf

There are no other single dwellings with 5 car parking spaces in setback, double crossovers, and 3m tall sound barriers anywhere in North Balgowlah hence the proposal is far from harmonious with its setting.

The application itself is difficult to assess due to many inconsistencies in the documentation; A) In some sections of reports operating hours are said to be 8:30am to 4:00pm, in others 8:00am to 4:00pm

B) Section 3.1 of the Statement of Environmental Effects references plans by "Distinctive Additions". Where are such plans.

C) The same section states the ground floor will be used as a Child Care Centre, whilst the plans show the entire property will be used as a Child Care Centre; no residential facilities will remain yet the change of use is not obvious

D) In section 3.2 of the Statement of Environmental Effects it states that drop off will start at 8:30 and parents will be allocated a 10 minute drop off time. How then can 90% of children (21.6 children) be dropped off before 9am without causing traffic and noise issues?

E) If operating hours end at 4pm, surely 100% of children must be picked up by then, not 90%?F) What are the actual operating hours during which staff will be on the premises? This is not stated anywhere.

G) DCP control C9 states an enclosed commercial waste management area within the ground floor collected by a commercial contractor. The building plans show normal residential type bins outside, in one of the access paths. Are commercial scale bins or residential bins proposed, will these be enclosed, will the enclosure still allow safe passage through the access way, and will these be collected during normal operating hours, or from kerbside? If kerbside where is it proposed to site bins for collection as the property frontage is required for parking access and visibility?

H) DCP control D7 states no change to the built form that would impact on views. However, the acoustic controls require 3m tall barriers that will be very visible from my and other properties I) The survey shows the patio is 5.07m setback, making the middle 2 parking spaces only suitable for small cars, not normal cars or the more common SUV's of North Balgowlah parents. This is a material factor in parking provisions that is not mentioned in the already unsatisfactory parking number, nor is it clear if these spaces will be marked "small car only" and how this will be managed

J) The master set of plans do not show the elevations nor substantialness of the proposed noise control barriers. At 20kg per m2 these will be significant additions to the built environment, views, and landscape and will significantly impact amenity for neighbours

K) The absence of any measurements on the master set of plans makes it very difficult to corroborate or refute claims of compliance, e.g. proportion of greenscape, size of unencumbered play area, if the car doors of 4 cars parked abreast could open sufficiently to extract a 3-5 year old from a car seat. Please have all of these aspects calculated and confirmed prior to any decision.

L) Remediation of natural light requirements in Activity Area 1 per BCA report could require large windows in the south elevation of the property as light cannot be borrowed from another room. This would affect the privacy of the centre and adjoining property to the south. It could also materially alter noise tests and projections of the acoustic report as materials that allow the passage of light can also allow the passage of sound. Given the acoustics are already at (and above) the permissible limit this is a major concern and must be addressed prior to any consent.

M) The introduction to the management plan says the centre is designed to cater for 54 children. This must be corrected so that hours, children, total staff/owners in attendance are all evaluated accurately.

N) According to https://www.acecqa.gov.au/nqf/educator-to-child-ratios the ratio of educator to child of age 3-5 is 1:10. It would seem, therefore, that 3 staff will be inadequate to meet the ratio when any staff member is on a break. Realistically does this mean there will be more actual staff on site and therefore more journeys, cars parked, noise than modelled? With this degree of error and omission can anyone be convinced that the application has not been carefully crafted to 'bury the detail'? The ambit claims of compliance, merit and that the proposal 'succeeds' do not appear to stand scrutiny when the proposal is looked at holistically.

Further to the above:

Crime is on the rise in our neighbourhood with vandalism, theft and drugs. I am concerned that a non-residential premises will be a target for crime or at least a place that is known to be unoccupied out of hours. What provisions are proposed to prevent this?

Our property is down bank from 16 Bangaroo Street. There are already issues with stormwater runoff, and the additional runoff from extensive hardscape at the front and rear of the property is of concern.

The unapproved enclosed area to the rear of the property has been included in the plan as though it is approved. This was not mentioned as non-compliant development in the survey or application. This matter should be resolved prior to consideration of this DA.

With the complaints procedure, what recourse will there be as complaints mount up? Anyone living locally will understand that this is inevitable in the event that the Centre is approved. Council (and police) will already see an increase in complaints prior to the DA, and this will only increase more as it becomes clear that the application doesn't reflect the locality; People walk down the centre of Worrobil Street to the bus every morning and night due to there being no footpaths

Reversing between a car and a wall via a curved course into Bangaroo so close to the roundabout and opposite the bus stop is simply not achievable for the average driver The streets are very narrow and when cars are double parked visibility is very restricted There is no footpath opposite the proposed double crossover so walkers, runners, kids on bikes and the locals on mobility scooters will have no choice but to cross the path of parents in a 10 minute drop off or penalty situation

When issues happen I would like to be certain that ultimately the level of issues will have consequences for the operators prior to someone getting injured or killed. The recent cycle accident on the roundabout 20 metres away from this location foretells the danger of the proposal. Would any approval be contingent on strict compliance to hours, parking, staff levels, noise, safety, and management plan, all being things that neighbours can measure and report?