

[REDACTED]

From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: Thursday, 29 August 2024 9:04 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

29/08/2024

[REDACTED]

RE: DA2024/1003 - 3 Rickard Road NORTH NARRABEEN NSW 2101

I provide the following objections to the proposed development for your consideration:

1. Building Height

Similarly to other non-compliant developments under assessment this proposed development has total height of 17.13m (including the structures above the roof level). This is more than double the 8.5m allowed in the LEP. This is not in keeping with the local environment and the mock up imagery shows what a dominating structure the proposed development would be. This is not in keeping with the local neighbourhood character, context or scale and leads to many issues including but not limited to:

- reduction of the right to light and privacy of neighbouring properties who would be dwarfed by the proposed structure
- Reduction in view sharing of existing dwellings who will have outlook and views heavily modified and obstructed by the dominant development building envelope.
- Reduced privacy due to the overbearing overlooking from the dominant proposed structure

There are now 3 developments within the close proximity of each other, 2-8 Rickard Road which now has a modification under review since September last year. With regard to 2-8 Richard consent from the section 34 conciliation conference should also have lapsed but was extended to 21 april 2024 due to covid. Prior to this date a modification application was lodged in sept 2023 and remains under assessment. The 2-8 Rickard road development does not set a precedent. However, there are many issues with this application relying on a comparison to the 2-8 Rickard Road development including but not limited to:

The consent was granted conditional to many factors including:

- Restricting original height from proposed 13.65 to a max of 12.95
- Increasing parking to meet minimum requirements of 55 spaces (previously only 40 catered for)
- Consideration for how to manage Aboriginal remains should they be discovered. There is nothing in the 1 -5 Rickard Road application around whether the site has been reviewed any potential Aboriginal connection or history
- The developers are required to pay Council a fee of \$320 000 to contribute to provision of public infrastructure and services assumably in recognition of the additional requirements and pressure a development of this nature places on an already overburdened infrastructure
- The consideration for the 1-5 Rickard Road development should bear in mind the additional pressure that will already placed on the area by the 2-8 rickard road development and the 1-3 gondola road development that is under assessment. All three of these developments intend to make heavy use of the same, narrow, already busy Minarto Lane for a combined total of:

Over 50 apartments

10 commercial/retail outlets

2. Appears to have inaccurate information submitted in the DA

- This DA incorrectly identifies the existing properties in the immediate vicinity of the Gondola/Verona/Minarto/Rickard block on Page 2 of the Plans - Master Set. The discrepancies in claims I am aware of are that:
- 1 and 3 Gondola is approved shop top housing. This is a vacant block with DA2024/0460 under assessment not approved
- The existing property at 9-11 Gondola is a parking level with two stories worth of apartments - not three storey shop top housing. The entire complex has only 10 apartments.
- I am not familiar with the exact composition of the 12 Rickard Road complex identified as three storey shop top housing so cannot comment on whether this is accurately depicted or not.

The information as presented paints an inaccurate picture of the current neighbourhood they are seeking to fit this development into. It makes it appear the application is in keeping with the neighbourhood but in actual fact it is significantly changing the current neighbourhood into a higher density housing area. Currently the neighbourhood is mostly houses with a couple of smaller apartment buildings of significantly fewer apartments and much lower building height than the one proposed in this DA.

3. Traffic impact, Minarto lane pressure and Pedestrian and Traffic safety

If all three of the proposed developments go ahead they will all use Minarto lane for access. 2-8 Rickard has 20 apartments and 3 commercial, 1-3 Gondola has 14 apartments and 2 commercial spaces and this DA has 16 apartments and 5 commercial spaces totally over 50 apartments and 10 commercial spaces so imagine all of these residents and business owners, users or visitors ALL proposed to use Minarto lane to access their buildings and commercial/retail spaces and delivery vans trying to do the same to supply the existing businesses in the area and the new businesses. Impacts to traffic in determining this application needs to look at the total impact of all three applications.

I also object to the predictions of the Terraffic report being anywhere close to reality. The existing 3 hours on the sites 1, 3 and 5 Rickard road would have minimal traffic and yet the traffic assessment concludes that the development will only contribute 13 additional vehicles per hour compared to the current level of traffic meanwhile the proposal replaces what is currently 3 houses with 16 apartments and 5 commercial spaces. This level of building requires for 46 car spaces and it appears highly likely that there would be this same number of vehicles would need to go bacn forth of the building at a minimum. The number of additional vehicles per hour in peak would therefore be close to 46. It could be much higher. A large proportion of residents in the local area have 2 adult parents with multiple teen/young adult children still living with them who have cars and driving licenses of their own. Therefore, in many cases a single 2-3 bedroom apartment or house can contribute an additional 3-5 cars on the road, many of the residents who have cars do not rely on the already overburdened public transport, which have been massively negatively impacted by both the privatisation of services and the current shortage in bus drivers. My day-to-day lived real life experience of current traffic issues and concerns in this area include:

The current traffic flow and infrastructure is already overburdened particularly during higher traffic times multiple times a day. This frequently leads to lengthy stays at the traffic lights particularly when trying to turn right from Gondola Road onto Pittwater Road and even moreso when travelling south on Pittwater road to turn right into Gondola Road. Even without these three new developments the right turn filter lane into Gondola from Pittwater backs up further than the filter lane. With the addition of the 14 apartments from 1-3 Gondola plus commercial and 20 apartments plus commercial from 2-8 Rickard and now this DA proposing a further 16 apartments and 5 commercial the total additional cars on the road will be well beyond what the area can support. A traffic report need that looks over the cumulative impact of the three developments and accurately predicts the total additional vehicles. It is most certain that this DA will contribute to more frequent, longer backing up of right turners beyond the filter lane which in turn will block all traffic trying to proceed straight on Pittwater Road. Particularly as those accessing the proposed development will need to immediately slow after turning right into Gondola in order to turn left into Minarto Lane this will result in a further slowing of traffic and backing up of traffic for those trying to turn into Gondola to access the local area and those that the roads feed such as Elanora Heights which has poor public transport and pedestrian/cycling access options. If this back up of traffic goes beyond the right turn filter lane it will also impact those trying to go straight on Pittwater road therefore impacting all Pittwater Road traffic. The commercial/retail businesses on Pittwater road that access their businesses from Minarto Lane also use this lane for deliveries and/or their parking. I can imagine the proposal would have an impact on both of these for the existing established businesses.

In terms of traffic safety and pedestrian safety this areas is already more dangerous than ideal as with the current

commercial eateries and the 7-11 there is already a lot of reasons why vehicles are pulling in and out in a high vehicle and pedestrian traffic area whilst other vehicles are trying to access the 7-11 and hold up traffic trying to turn in or out of the 7-11 whilst also waiting for pedestrians or vehicles who are accessing the commercial outlets. I have seen many near misses for both vehicles and pedestrians with the current amount of traffic particularly when it comes to foot traffic walking to the buses or local retail outlets trying to cross over Minarto Lane towards Pittwater Road. Couriers and Uber Eats pickup cars frequently stop here illegally and cause further safety and traffic blocking. If Minarto Lane is also to become the key access to the 1-3 Gondola Road and the 2-8 Rickard Road development and now this 1-5 Rickard Road development it will be absolute chaos at this crossing. The proposed development will increase both foot and vehicle traffic and the already unacceptable risks will be exacerbated beyond any reasonably acceptable level of safety for pedestrians and motorists combined.

A large proportion of the pedestrian and vehicle traffic who's safety would be put at further risk includes high risk groups such as families with young children and/or unsupervised teens either as foot traffic or bicycle traffic particularly with cycle paths to the lake and school buses being able to be accessed nearby

With the cumulative effect of the three developments the whole area would need a major investment in infrastructure including a major uplift in parking available and a complete review of the vehicle and pedestrian traffic plan and flow for both the immediate (North Narrabeen) and connected areas (Elanora Heights) in order to managed the traffic and increased vehicle and pedestrian safety risk impacts of the developments. It is not a solution to use a small lane (Minarto Lane) as the major access road. Before supporting any developments that increase traffic, significant pre planning and investment into how other connecting roads could be used and how traffic flow could be improved to prevent what would otherwise lead to traffic and pedestrian chaos in the area that would be incredibly unsafe.

4. Parking and Transport

The development proposed provides for 4 parking spaces less than is required. The 1-3 Gondola proposal also has 5 less parking spaces than is acceptable. So between the two buildings there are 9 less parking spaces than acceptable. The development proposed incorrectly claims that the B-Line is an appropriate comparison to a light rail and that it is less than the required 800 metres away. It incorrectly claims to be 580 metres away from the B Line. However, Google maps identifies it to be 1000 metres away. A similar incorrect claim was made by the 1-3 Gondola Road DA which is also not within 800 metres of the B Line but claims that it is in order to receive the concession on number of car parking spaces required. Notably the 2-8 Rickard Road development assessment (which is a similar distance from the B Line to 1-5 Rickard Road) correctly identifies that this area is NOT within the appropriate distance from the B Line for a concession on the minimum parking requirements and that the B Line is NOT a light rail equivalent under which reduced parking provisions might be considered, the conditions of the appeal consent for 2-8 Rickard Road therefore included increasing parking to meet minimum requirements of 55 spaces (previously only 40 catered for). It is not appropriate for any concession to not meet minimum parking requirements for the proposed development at 1-5 Rickard to be considered. Just as with the 2-8 Rickard plans had to be amended to meet minimum requirements any DA in this area should be enforced to do the same. Particularly since the parking requirements they need to comply with themselves are out of date with the reality of how many cars most apartments have per apartment in the current economic climate where adult children remain living with their parents and many adults without children are apartment sharing and all have cars in areas such as the northern beaches where transport options are so poor, overcrowded and unreliable due to driving shortages and privatisation.

The provision of only 3 visitor spaces for 16 apartments and 5 commercial units is particularly under allocated. A development of this size would need significantly more than that.

There is also no delivery/courier bay which is a requirement for a development of this size and, based on my observations of the delivery/courier pressure Minarto Lane is already under would definitely be required.

If the development does not provide sufficient parking this will place further pressure on surrounding area parking which is already insufficient. As families in the area who started living in the area with young children who have now become teenagers and young adults the number of cars per household in the area have grown significantly leading to more parking pressure. Furthermore, the current public transport issues are leading to more people driving instead of taking transport and there is also an increase in people from adjoining areas like Elanora Heights driving

down to catch transport from the services available from Pittwater Road to reduce their overall commute time.

With regards to reliance on public transport the key route of 199 and 190X are already heavily oversubscribed during peak times. Since privatisation of the service:

the number of planned services on both of these routes have decreased

The number of planned services that are cancelled regularly have increased

The bus driver shortages continue to impact the provision of bus services

Our household regularly uses both the 199 and 190X services and frequently wait extended periods and/or cannot get a seat when a bus finally arrives. This has worsened in peak hours to the point that sometimes even when a bus arrives it may be too full to take on any passengers and you have to wait until the next one which might be 15 minutes away. The proposed development would place additional pressure on an already oversubscribed service that is inadequate to meet current requirements let alone increased requirements and therefore public transport available cannot be relied on as an effective reasoning to concede on the minimum parking requirements.

5. Flooding and stormwater pollution

There is a high level of flooding risk and a history of repeat flooding in the area.

6. Environmental impact/Hazards

Noted that is difficult to assess all of the environmental impact particularly with the existing dwellings however the development proposed holds concern for impact on:

Potential asbestos in demolition given the ages of the existing dwellings.

7. Overall environment and character

The building is visually disconnecting and does not fit the local character using excessive building envelope and curves.

It is a large industrial sized development not in keeping with the local area objectives. A development of this size would be better suited to an area with similar sized developments in the surrounds where it would not dominate to the extent that it would in the current location. Alternatively if there is a need to develop affordable housing to meet the housing crisis this is not an affordable area to look to convert or change the overall environment and character of.

The development proposed fails to meet/satisfy many of the Apartment Design Guide criteria

8. Disruption to residents during the demolition and development & Safety

A development of this size and scale will result in a large amount of noise and traffic disruption to surrounding residents for an extended period of time especially in comparison to a development of a more appropriate scale and particularly if all three of the proposed developments proceed and overlap in the construction. The cumulative impact would make the area virtually inaccessible and uninhabitable for existing residents with extended delays in accessing to/from their own properties whilst the traffic flow is impacted by the extended period of heavy construction vehicles and access required. A plan to manage pedestrian safety for those accessing buses and surrounding businesses would be essential and yet seeming impossible to achieve if three oversized developments within the same immediate proximity were to proceed at the same time.

9. Display of development notice

I did not see development notices on display. I only became aware because I was one of the properties who received a letter. Speaking to local residents it appears many were not aware of the development application and this may mean those in the area impacted have not had an opportunity to make a submission should they wish to.

10. Cumulative impact of the 3 developments in close proximity:

If all three of the proposed developments go ahead there will be a compounding effect of all of the issues raised. The associated applications are all within incredibly close proximity of each other utilising all of the same surrounding transport, infrastructure, access etc.

- DA2024/1003

- DA2024/0460

- Mod2023/03473

In summary, I strongly object to the proposed development.

I understand that the owners have a right to develop the land but feel strongly that this development, as with the others in the area needs to comply with the LEP and other planning controls and in doing so contribute positively to the local area.

The LEP is there for a reason and has a lot of input and planning in it's creation. It offers protection to those who have already invested in and/or reside in the area.

For property owners to put forward developments that blatantly ignore the LEP controls and compliance to other key factors such as parking, is not reasonable nor is it fair to those who have already invested and/or reside in the area based on the current environment, neighbourhood and with the understanding that this is protected from overdevelopment under the LEP.

Development proposals need to be in keeping with the local character and in line with the requirements such as appropriate size, parking, consideration to impact to surrounding properties and area e.g. traffic and noise etc to name a few. The proposed development as it stands does not do any of these things and instead would cause local chaos both during and particularly after the completion of the development.

The end result would be overdevelopment that would negatively impact traffic, safety and overall lifestyle of existing local residents and businesses.

Additionally the proposed development is highly unlikely to do anything to assist with local housing and affordable housing issues as, being in this location, the price point of these apartments would not be affordable to the demographic being most in need.

Thank you for your consideration of the above in considering the development application.

Even if the three development proposals are brought in line with the LEP their cumulative effect would still require an investment in the infrastructure and transport to support them.

██████████