
Sent: 5/08/2020 11:54:37 PM
Subject: Online Submission

05/08/2020

MR Peter Sprott
- 12 Mavor CRES
Frenchs Forest NSW 2086
psprott@live.com

RE: DA2020/0744 - 635 Warringah Road FORESTVILLE NSW 2087

RE: DA2020/0744 & 0745 - 633-635 Warringah Road FORESTVILLE NSW 2087

To Northern Beaches Council - Planning Assessor

I have reviewed the above mentioned development applications and would like to submit my objection based on the following.

1. Over development - The reason for this is that each allotment contains a building with 12 boarding rooms, and it is a requirement that the development provide vehicular access and car parking on its own allotment. The shared use of the driveway by both developments would be considered an over development of the sites.
2. Privacy concerns - the plans submitted show a double storey building built to the minimum boundary setbacks. The second storey rooms (4 per application, 8 in total) each have a balcony and sliding door which look directly into the backyards of at least 4 homes in Mavor Crescent. This is a complete invasion of privacy on families with young children playing or swimming in their back yard. With the building being so close to the back fence there is no possibility to screen out these 2nd storey balconies and with a continual turnover of guests (3 month minimum stay) there will be unacceptable access for strangers to be watching young children play in their own backyard which is meant to be their safe haven.
3. Traffic and Parking Assessment Report - The report claims that on the existing site there is significant on-site parking with 15 spaces. Having lived behind the Veterinary hospital for over 20 years I have never seen 15 vehicles parked in the property. I believe this is misleading. Under the traffic controls section of the report, they refer to "the roundabouts along Starkey Street and Cook Street" which is not relevant to the development which is on Warringah Road. Again, I believe this has been added to mislead the reader into thinking that these traffic calming controls are relevant to this proposed development and they are not. They also claim, "the 60 kmph speed restriction this section of Warringah Road" This is just wrong. The speed limit is 70 kmph and there is a sign just 100 m before the proposed development.

Not only is the speed limit 70kmph but the development is situated around a blind corner as shown by a large "caution" road sign, just 120m from the proposed development. This is obviously a known area of fast traffic as the Northern Beaches council have placed "slow down" signs to the base of the caution sign. This seems to have been overlooked in the Traffic report especially in section 6.1 Access where the report claims that, "at this location is straight".

The report mentions that in Warringah road, "some former residences are being consolidated and redeveloped for medium density apartments" but it fails to mention that some of these developments have provided a safer "pull off lane" before their driveways and these are in sections of the road that do not have caution signs. These type of safety improvements need to be included considering the increased number of cars slowing and pulling into the proposed site.

Under section 3.3 Traffic Conditions the report refers to, "Data¹ published by RMS" and claims annual average daily traffic (AADT) of 65,701. (Data not properly referenced in the report so I could not check)

However, a simple search on the internet found the following report "Northern Beaches Hospital Stage 2 EIS - Network Enhancement Works Traffic and Transport Impact Client - written by GTA consultants for SMEC Australia Office, NSW Reference // 14S9025500 Date // 14/07/15"

In this report it is noted that daily traffic volumes were 76100 in front of the proposed development back in 2012 (8-year-old data from the RMS).

This is 10,399 additional vehicles back in 2012 and since that date the hospital has been built and many other developments completed including numerous boarding houses in the area which all mean additional traffic volumes.

In the submitted Traffic and Parking Assessment Report, it is my belief that the assumptions under section 5-Traffic, are incorrect as well. Living behind the Vet for 20 years and using their services for my own pet I have never seen 5 to 10 vtpm at any time. The vehicle movements would have only been 2 to 4 vtpm during the peak period. Also, the Vet has a fence separating the front customer parking area from the back of the property resulting in a maximum of 4 or 5 customer parking spots only.

Additionally, the assumptions in the report that there would only be 2 out bound traffic movements in the morning and 2 in bound movements in the afternoon for the boarding house just seem far too light. They state that the, "traffic guidelines do not specify a peak traffic generation characteristic relevant to boarding house". With the number of boarding house developments that have already been built in the Northern Beaches I would consider it incumbent on the council to have independent traffic studies carried out on the existing boarding house to ensure that both Council and the community are provided with accurate data on typical traffic movements.

Section 6.3-Servicing, claims "service personnel or maintenance vehicles etc. will be reliant on the available on-street parking in the area or within the garage area subject to arrangement with the Boarding House Manager." It must be noted that there is NO on street parking on Warringah Rd. The nearest on street parking would be on Emperor Place some 100m down the road and which is a very small cul de sac and already has parking problems for the residents in Emperor Pl.

With the lack of on street parking a development like this should be at least made to provide additional on-site parking areas for the service and maintenance personnel.

Based on the above commentary on the traffic report I would consider that due to the blind corner, caution signs and 70kmph speed limit there are safety implications and due to no convenient on street parking within a reasonable distance of the development that the parking provisions are not appropriate.

I sincerely hope you take these objections into consideration and refuse this application.

Regards,
Peter