

From: Lynne Czinner [lynneczinner@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 3 February 2014 6:42:55 PM
To: Pittwater Council; WRA
Subject: complementary submission on PP 0007/13

Further to previous submissions

(In my first submission sent via the email address on Council web site I miscalculated the potential number of dwellings. It would be somewhere between 100-300 depending on the size of the apartments in 33,300 - 35,000 sq m of gross area.)

The development proposes some employment opportunities which is positive. The quoted numbers may be either/or incorrect or inconsistent' as it appears that they vary from place to place.

The report says "The SHOROC (ELS) and addendum identified a projected required increase in RETAIL floor space of 106,708 sqm to facilitate the accommodation of 3771 employment positions." Without access to this document I ask, did it say that this amount of floor space was needed for just retail, as further on the report this area appears to include "office space and business parks"

Recommendation 1.6 of the Strategic Review says "future planning proposals must address the constraints and opportunities highlighted by this review including the impact on any proposed development, on the environment, on other centres, recreation lands and community expectations. Most are addressed; recreation lands appears to be glossed over No figures appear to be supplied to substantiate the assertion that realigning the playing fields will provide the required active sports fields. I believe the land release area is already short of active open space.

Community expectations have certainly not been canvassed and I believe NO ONE expected an application for 7 storey apartments of 25m so soon after the Strategic Review which limited the height in other parts of the Valley to 10m

Noise: the report says "the site is not in close proximity to Pittwater Rd so will not be affected by noise from the carriageway and the road noise source."

Nonsense; it is within close proximity to Pittwater Rd. I live on the edge of the escarpment and there are days when I can hear the noise from Pittwater Rd.

Boondah Rd, now elevated, will also be a source of road noise -- the issue of road noise may not be important but to make such an inaccurate claim is careless and misleading to say the least. The upper floors--if any-- will undoubtedly hear the road noise from both roads.

"The Masterplan identifies significant beneficial outcomes in the establishment of a focal centre for the surrounding urban centre"

'We already have, including the expansion of Warriewood Centro, a focal centre of about optimum size.

If it is too big it is not beneficial, it is a nightmare, e.g. DY and Warringah Mall and now Roseberry Rd in Manly Vale / Balgowlah east. Traffic round and about and in all of these areas is a nightmare and as they were not planned but grew like Topsy they do not make intuitive sense any more.

There is nothing to justify at what size a shopping precinct / mixed use complex becomes "beneficial". and at what size it is not beneficial.

There must therefore be an assumption that more and bigger are better. This is typical of how a developer thinks rather than how the end user thinks.

"The proposal demonstrates a capacity for integration with an expanded Warriewood Centre (note Centre, not Centro)

and the creation of a more traditional "high street" rather than a fully enclosed centre." Presumably this is meant to be more beneficial.

Given that this development is on the floor of the Valley where it's very hot, a fully enclosed Centre with covered car parking would be seem to be much more user friendly and beneficial.

Given the shape of the land holdings a fully enclosed centre is probably not possible; shoppers will have to walk or drive quite some distance between shops and offices. It will no doubt be similar to the Industrial area in Warriewood or Belrose so why has this (maybe wildly inaccurate) statement been made. For what purpose?? So we will be misled into thinking it is to be of "human scale"?

What is the attraction of a "high street" over an enclosed air conditioned centre in this locality? Workmen come to Warriewood Centro to eat lunch in the air conditioned food court. Older folk sit in the air conditioned comfort of the fully enclosed centre. It has its benefits! When it rains we are dry. In any case I see no benefit of the "high street" model? Just take the north side of Park Street Mona Vale as an example of a "high street." It has nothing positive going for it; it's a visual and design disaster.

Addressing "Connecting NSW-- The Transport Blueprint" priorities includes "increased reliance on walking and cycling." This is admirable.

This may be achieved if all the multi use paths in Warriewood --you cant ride a bike through the wetlands from Garden St -- are over 2.1m wide and sign posted for both walking and riding.

Failing this it is illegal for a cyclist over the age of 12 to ride on a 1.2 m wide footpath (unless accompanying an under 12) and they have to ride on the road. These are getting narrower and narrower and more and more dangerous with more and more vehicles.

I can't see many of us getting the weekly shop home on a bike! There are very few bikes ever parked at Warriewood Centro.

The bike riding rules can only be changed by the RMS.

There is a good case for BOTH under 12s and over e.g. 55s to be able to ride on any footpath.

If the developers think the "green roof" is suitable for passive recreation, I suspect they are at odds with the community's view of same. Passive recreation is walking, cycling, scooters, pushing little children in prams and strollers etc and walking the dog, and is partaken of by residents of all ages. Roof top green space would be good for sitting and a BBQ etc--and a very good use of the roof area--but not for passive recreation as defined in Council documents..

There is no assessment of "community facilities" and if they could be accommodated within this development or if this is even desirable.

I note that the Dept of Education asked that the developer pay for the extra class rooms needed if the PPs in Warriewood Rd and Macpherson St were approved as class rooms are not sufficient locally.

Conclusion. The use of this land for employment generation is to be commended. But NO 7 storey/25 m apartments. If the development complies with the LEP for the rest of Warriewood Valley as altered recently after the Strategic Review, the passive and active open space needs of the community are met and the surrounding infrastructure can accommodate the resultant increases caused by the development it has some merit.

Whether or not any dwellings are desirable in a "mixed development zone " I do not know. I would not like to live in a shopping / industrial precinct with vehicles coming and going all day from 7am until midnight.

The development area is close to the main road and public transport. The quickest way home to walk home from the bus through the playing fields is often wet and is flood prone.

Regards

Lynne Czinner

To be equitable and fair to all the other residents in the Warriewood Land Release Area the going rate for the S94 contribution must be paid.

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by MCI's Internet Managed Scanning Services - powered by MessageLabs. For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>