

From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 10/10/2021 11:41 AM
To: "DA Submission Mailbox" <DASubmission@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Online Submission

10/10/2021

MS Ann Skarratt
12 / 32 Undercliff RD
Freshwater NSW 2096
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2021/1620 - 31 Moore Road FRESHWATER NSW 2096

Dear Council,

I strongly object to the DA for the following reasons.

I was not notified of the DA by Council even though I live very close to the Hotel - there are only seven houses between the Hotel and my home. The notification process for this DA, which is for significant work that would affect a large part of Freshwater, is woefully inadequate.

It is not clear from the DA how many additional patrons are proposed. The Colston Budd Rogers and Kafes Traffic and Parking Report at pages 1 and 3 says there will be an increase of 80 patrons from 820 to 900. The Boston Blyth Statement of Environmental Effects at pages 11, 19 and 25 says there will be an increase of 50 patrons. Which is correct? If something as fundamental as the proposed number of additional patrons is not consistent in the DA, it's difficult to be confident about the rest of it.

Harbord Hotel is situated in a residential area, completely surrounded by residents in their homes. It is not in a CBD or commercial area. The Acoustic Report does not address the 49% (according to the Traffic and Parking Report) of the 900 patrons who would walk to and from the Hotel. Meaning it is proposed that 441 patrons would walk the nearby residential streets. I am often disturbed at night by noise from these people. In the morning I pick up empty beer bottles discarded by patrons on the footpath. This disturbance would only become worse with the addition of more patrons.

The DA says that additional waste collection would be required, but doesn't say at what time this would occur. If it is early in the morning it would further disturb residents.

The addition of bars, lounges and live music on level one is at odds with the previous use of that area as a quiet residence, and in earlier days as hotel rooms for overnight guests. The further addition of a recording studio in the attic is not part of what a hotel does or should do, particularly in a residential area. The DA seeks to overdevelop the Hotel site.

The Statement of Environment Effects says the DA proposes non compliant roof height. I object to any additional height above the existing roof line as that would adversely impact the view from my home. Further, the Hotel is subject to a Heritage listing. Surely that Heritage listing should be respected and the roof line retained as is.

Undercliff Road is already extremely busy with both vehicles and bicycles, and it is too narrow to even have a centre line between lanes. Undercliff Road is part of Council's Bike Plan 2020 - Road Cycling Network. It is already difficult to safely get out of my driveway. The Traffic and Parking Report says 50% of Hotel patrons arrive by vehicle (drivers, passengers, taxi/ride share, and dropped off). The addition of 50% more vehicles for the additional patrons would put even more pressure on this road and others nearby. Parking is already a big problem in the area around the Hotel, and the DA would only accentuate that.

Stage 1 of the Hotel redevelopment work occurred during lockdown in 2020. The Hotel was closed and the carpark was full with tradie vehicles. If this DA for Stage 2 was approved and the Hotel remained open during the work, the carpark would not be available for the work. Tradie parking would add further to the existing parking problem on local streets during the construction.

The Harbord Hotel website says "its evolution has been designed with everyone in mind, but locals at the heart". The DA instead puts commercial gain ahead of the amenity of those locals.