

---

**Sent:** 20/08/2021 9:40:39 AM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

20/08/2021

MR Stewart Walters  
10 / 129 - 131 Darley St West ST  
Mona Vale NSW 2103  
ozwalt@bigpond.net.au

**RE: PEX2021/0001 - 161 Darley Street West MONA VALE NSW 2103**

As a resident of 129-131 Darley Street West, I strongly oppose the proposed rezoning of the properties contained within 159-167 Darley Street West, Mona Vale from R2 Low Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential and the proposal to amend clause 4.5 A(3) of Pittwater LEP 2014 to include reference to 159-167 Darley Street West, Mona Vale for the following reasons:

1. Historical Use - The zoning of these above properties has historically remained at R2 for various reasons but primarily because of the natural water course between Darley Street West & Park Street. The argument that having R3 zoning in the rest of Darley Street West does not set a precedent for change since the rest of the street is not categorised as "a flood prone area"

2. Overdevelopment - Currently in Darley Street West the developments on the southern side contain approximately 11-12 apartments/townhouses per double block.

It would appear that #'s 159-165 are proposing 19-20 apartments per block with #167 showing 3 townhouses.

The proposed amendment to Pittwater LEP Clause 4.5A(3) for the site is totally inappropriate for Darley Street West specifically and Mona Vale generally.

3. Parking Concerns - it is not possible to determine from the proposed drawings whether the 3 townhouses have single or double above ground garaging - with accommodation for 3 bedrooms they would need at least double garaging off street and looking at the parking requirement plan Building A which has 20 apartments appears to only supply 34 resident parking spaces where in reality they will require 40 and Building B with 19 apartments would require 38 parking spaces, plus visitor off street parking.

It is not reasonable to say that the overflow can park in the street

4. Traffic - With a proposed redevelopment of some 41 dwellings that would be at least 82 extra motor vehicles coming and going from the end of a cul-de-sac at various times of the day and night. Congestion at the nearest intersection cannot be mitigated by further delaying the existing local traffic using other traffic flow devices - such as right-hand turn arrows.

A development that is in keeping with current rules and densities is reasonable and accepted, but this proposal is extremely opportunistic and inequitable and we seek your ruling to limit to current standards and densities.

Your help is appreciated

Kind Regards  
Stewart Walters