
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 20/08/2024 4:31:32 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

20/08/2024

MS Yi Wang
- 43 Undercliff RD
Freshwater NSW 2096

RE: PEX2024/0005 - 31 Moore Road FRESHWATER NSW 2096

The owners of Harbord Hotel Holdings or any associated representatives have not been in consultation with the neighbouring property owners for consultation, which was one of the council's strong recommendations as part of this submission. If they had done, they would know that there is serious objection to the proposed development as it is not consistent with the character of the area and the residential nature of the vicinity.

Moreover, the fact that the existing DCP and LEP is under review means that residents such as myself cannot put in a considered objection without knowing what the new parameters are, as the most recent item I can find on it is from meeting minutes that show it is currently in development:

https://northernbeaches.infocouncil.biz/Open/2024/06/OC_17062024_MIN_2568_EXTRA.PDF. Given submissions are sought to understand 'Whether the proposed development is consistent with the intention for the area as expressed in Council's Local Environmental Plans and Development Control Plans' and these plans are currently under review and subject to change, I argue that the Council's future direction is not currently knowable, which significantly damages the ability to make a submission that is in line future direction and therefore effective.

Regarding how the development addresses the street and adjoining properties: I observe in the DA proposal that has been prepared by BBF Town Planners that the photos included in the street are of the largest and most grand houses in the vicinity. If the photos were more inclusive and reflective of the actual character of the street, it would be obvious that this is a residential area and zoned as such (albeit with high foot traffic given the proximity to the beach). As such, the proposed submission is not consistent with the residential low-density nature or the neighbouring infrastructure designed to support it, which comprises of a local shopping area that hosts a small IGA and some local stores.

Further, there is effectively only one bus route (167) to support this proposed increase in patrons and tourists as the 165X does not run on weekends, and only during weekday peak hours, which is largely irrelevant to a pub and/or hotel as they are used by commuters transporting to/from the CBD for work. The existing buses into and out of Manly are already overflowing on summer days (and come every 30 minutes), thus increased users on this service would exacerbate the existing strain for residents who do not have access to other transportation.

Specifically, how the current building design will directly impact on me - I am a resident of

Undercliff Road, which is situated behind the Harbord Hotel. There will be view loss for me of the ocean (I can currently see the ocean above and behind 64 Undercliff Road from my window, but given the planned increase in visual bulk this will change for the worse). Further, there will be a lack of privacy due to the 37 proposed rooms, via the multiple windows higher up and potentially eye-level to my house.

The modern layout will also destroy the charm of some of the recently renovated designs along the street, which are ostensibly suburban in character. I also urge Council to strongly consider Harbord Hotel's rich history and heritage façade. While I appreciate a heritage report is included, it does conclude that it is 'generally' consistent i.e., not entirely consistent. Nevertheless, I would argue that the conclusions of the report are moot given the existing structure (pub) is largely unchanged - and the assessment on heritage should be based solely on the proposed hotel development.

I have also observed since the developments that there is an increase in drunk and disorderly people who have no regard for the fact that this is a residential area. I appreciate that Harbord Hotel is a pub and recognise that this was the case when I purchased the property. However, the recent street signs that have been put up stating that no public drinking is to occur outside of the pub is not at all enforced and I routinely observe drinking on these streets, sometimes even on my curb. There has been one particular instance where I had three residents leave the pub, sit on my front lawn while waiting for their uber, and drunkenly harass and intimidate me as I entered my property. On a weekend, the vicinity is littered with cans, shattered glass and occasionally vomit. I have lost count of the number of discarded bottles left on my lawn, and it is distressing to know that what I and other residents do not pick up, will end up in the ocean threatening local marine life. While it may be argued that I could be conflating hotel residents with pub patrons, they are effectively one and the same given the increased development recently and the likely clientele of the hotel. An article from the Guardian on the impacts of tourism on the environment can be found here (which I acknowledge is hyperbolic, but the comparison remains valid regardless):

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2024/feb/03/a-free-for-all-japan-divided-as-return-of-tourists-brings-instagrammers-and-litter>:

'But like many locals, she took exception to litter louts and nuisance influencers who trample on local customs and treat busy locations like their personal photo studio'.

I also object to 64 Undercliff Road's lot effectively being rezoned from a residential site to a commercial one. I won't rehash the same arguments I have already made, but the points that apply to limited public transport, quiet streets and traffic remain. There will also be additional noise pollution from an increase in patrons, vehicles (from the proposed parking lot), etc.

I strongly urge the Council to reconsider this development. My arguments have been largely emotive in nature. However, this is because the DA submission concerns a residential area with families, not large corporations or medium-sized businesses. Notwithstanding, there is significant residential opposition to this (which Harbord Hotel would know if they spoke to the residents) with unexplored legal avenues.