11th November 2019

SCANNED NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL

1 5 NOV 2019

20

Northern Beaches Council 725 Pittwater Road DEE WHY NSW 2099

Dear Sir/Madam

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Application No:

DA2019/1173

Address:

Description:

Lot A DP 411784 3 Berith Street Wheeler Heights Demolition of existing development and construction

of a Seniors Housing development comprising 6 x infill Self care housing units and basement parking, and

Strata subdivision

We object to this latest application for the following reasons

MISSING REPORTS

Although stated as "provided" there is no demolition plan.

Excavation and waste management are marked as "not required" This is amazing considering the fibro and asbestos wall and roofing materials.

Construction traffic management "not required" We have already experienced the B double trucks parked, exiting and idling in our street from the Rose Avenue development from 6.30am.

CONTRADICTIONS IN REPORTS

Car spaces - 10 according to Basix no spaces according to private certifier Access Assessment 8 spaces and 4 visitor

Number of bedrooms – 3 each according to Basix (3/20) should be 2 only for single height buildings

Commitments for residential flat buildings. We assume this is simply lazy generic ticks for swimming pool, spas, etc (6/20) cooling tower (11/20) etc

> NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL

1 3 NOV 2019

GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

Refusal at 1.0m that means up to 3.7m of rock removal still a first on the plateau we believe (page 3).

"water table is expected to be many metres below" – more than 4.7m - I wonder ?? (page 4) – why then has the school built a containment wall at the rear of this and adjoining property ???

Risk analysis – lists the hazards as unacceptable (page 5)

Vibrations are likely to be felt in neighbouring houses (6). People 100m from the Rose Avenue development are reporting windows rattling, etc. Who will compensate for damages to our and surrounding houses should cracks develop, or worse??

The volume of "rock" to be removed is calculated at over 2000 cubic metres.

PRIVATE CERTIFIERS

Designs see 3.1.4.2 "I am of the view that design will require redesign or alternative"

Accessible facilities and services – complies if services no more than 400m. Despite every report differing, the closest real distance is 425m Page 5. My measurements using a navigation app on my phone and using the pedestrian crossing are 452m – this therefore **does not comply**.

Visitor parking – states there are 2 available (15) – there are none.

States building is brick and tile – actually fibro with brick veneer and corrugated asbestos roof (6).

Compatible with adjoining properties – no one else is effectively 3 stories with a 4m basement. Majority of residences in Berith Street over 40 years old.

Building height does not impact on views – someone really needs to view this proposal from 5 Berith Street.

Public open space "the site is located within walking distance of Narrabeen Lakes and a plethora of open space recreational areas." The lakes at their closest would be at least 600m away on a gradient approaching 1 in 3 or 4. The other "walk" would take you down Veterans Parade with a continuous gradient and about 1km away. We laughed with the "plethora of open spaces" — surely not either of the school grounds, perhaps Plateau Park 800m or St Matthews Farm about 1 km !!!

Density of Scale 0.5:1 or less actual 0.57:1 **Does not comply**. Do we really need to discuss this further? I cannot think of any industry that would accept "close enough" page 30.

15% deep soil – the geotech report points out there is no deep soil.

Rear set back - min 6m - Does not comply.

Public interest – we understand the Rose Avenue developments have not sold. The RSL Anzac Village is putting in significant new developments. We who live in Berith Street are members of the public also. I see only interest being monetary by a single investor.

Apex Engineers (9) relating to accessibility – "The subject site is considered not to be within accessible area"

Collaroy Plateau/Wheeler Heights has more than its fair share of seniors living, with the RSL village, the already approved developments in Rose avenue and further applications in the same area.

We firmly believe the vested interest of one individual should not outweigh the concerns of 30 or more families.

We believe this development will never be used for its stated purpose and that ordinary families will purchase these units as soon as possible bringing a far greater vehicle density to the street.

The re-hash of the previous application (DA2018/1828) does nothing to allay our fears.

Christine and Robert Barnes