
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 23/05/2025 9:45:17 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

23/05/2025

MR H Bazzi
161 Balgowlah RD
Balgowlah NSW 2093
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2025/0132 - 37 Roseberry Street BALGOWLAH NSW 2093

Re: DA2025/0132 - Subsequent Submission Opposing Amended Proposal for McDonald's, 37 Roseberry Street, Manly Vale

Dear Northern Beaches Council Development Assessment Team,

I write to provide a subsequent submission opposing the amended Development Application DA2025/0132 for the McDonald's restaurant at 37 Roseberry Street, Manly Vale. This submission is intended to introduce new concerns based on the applicant's revised plans and documentation, rather than rehash previous objections.

E3 Zone Compatibility - Signage and Operating Hours

The applicant claims that the revised signage and reduced hours (from 24/7 to 5:00 am-12:00 am) will mitigate conflicts with surrounding residential land uses. However, no enforceable conditions or long-term commitments are proposed to ensure signage remains minimal over time. Similar assurances were given during the 2014 Balgowlah Woolworths signage approval, which later escalated through amendments and modifications, increasing visual clutter despite initial objections.

More importantly, the E3 zone's purpose is to minimise conflicts between employment uses and sensitive residential neighbours. Despite reductions, this remains a high-traffic fast-food drive-thru fundamentally inconsistent with residential amenity, especially considering extended hours approaching midnight.

Streetscape Amenity (Clause 3.1.2, MDCP)

The applicant states that the revised signage scheme "ensures a high level of visual quality." However, this term remains undefined and unsupported by independent design or heritage assessments. No street-level before-and-after renderings have been provided to verify the claim of "less visually dominant" signage. Developments such as the Dee Why Town Centre redevelopment have shown how initial promises of low visual impact often result in commercialised streetscapes after approval.

Setbacks and Visual Intrusion (Clause 4.3.5, MDCP)

While the reduction in pylon height is acknowledged, the proposal still breaches the 4.5m

setback requirements. The applicant's vague promise that landscaping will compensate for visual impact lacks detailed landscaping plans specifying species, height, and growth timelines. The Bunnings Narrabeen development exemplifies how promised landscaping buffers often remain immature for years, failing to screen visual bulk as intended.

Signage Scale and Quantity (Clause 4.4.3, MDCP)

Although several signage elements were removed, the proposal still exceeds Council's guidance on the number and size of identification signs. The applicant relies on "design merit" without providing independent urban design or signage impact assessments, raising concerns about potential overriding of Council policy based on unverified claims. The McDonald's Collaroy site provides a precedent where initial signage restrictions were circumvented through later modifications, leading to visual dominance beyond the original consent.

Furthermore, despite some reductions, the overall number of signs remains excessive, especially with multiple signs facing residential streets such as Kenneth Road. Pylon signs remain at 5.7m-almost double the recommended "human scale" of 3m-contravening Council's policy discouraging dominant streetscape signage.

Traffic Engineering and Access

The applicant claims internal parking complies with AS2890.1 and proposes a roundabout at Roseberry and Hayes Streets after approval. Deferring the roundabout design until post-consent raises serious concerns, as such delayed infrastructure commitments often result in compromised or abandoned traffic solutions. For instance, Northern Beaches Hospital upgrades faced delayed traffic mitigation implementation, causing disruption to surrounding areas.

Additionally, discrepancies in traffic modeling-missing 15 and 20 vehicle movements on weekday and Saturday data respectively-undermine the credibility of the applicant's traffic impact claims. This echoes issues from the Beacon Hill Childcare Centre development, where underestimated traffic caused gridlock and safety concerns soon after opening.

Acoustic Impacts

The applicant vaguely references "barrier attenuation" and rooftop screening but provides no detailed schematics or acoustic modeling for the proposed screening. The assumed 50% reduction in vehicle noise at night is not explained or justified. Similar assumptions at the Allambie Heights aged care expansion led to significant underestimation of noise, with post-approval monitoring revealing higher noise levels from night-time deliveries and vehicle movements.

Hours of Operation

While the applicant now proposes trading hours from 5:00 am to 12:00 am, no condition locks this into consent, leaving the door open for future modifications. Given the trend of operators seeking extended hours through Section 4.55 applications after commencement, this reduction should be viewed with caution. The Mona Vale McDonald's originally had limited hours but obtained extended trading within 18 months, leading to increased amenity impacts on residents.

Community Submissions

The applicant claims to have reviewed community objections and made changes, but there is no evidence of genuine community consultation or engagement. The amendments appear superficial and motivated by minimum compliance rather than true responsiveness. The Seaforth Aldi application is a relevant comparison, where despite hundreds of objections, developers made minimal changes initially and later reverted to original plans through modifications.

In conclusion, while the applicant has made some amendments, the proposal still leaves significant and unresolved issues that cannot be overlooked-issues of zone incompatibility, excessive signage, detrimental streetscape impact, ongoing traffic and safety risks, unacceptable acoustic disturbance, and a troubling lack of enforceable controls on hours and signage. These are not mere technicalities; they are real, tangible threats to the quality of life and well-being of the residents who call this community home.

We, the people of Manly Vale and the surrounding areas, have made it clear-we do not want this McDonald's in our neighbourhood. This is not simply about development; it is about preserving the character, peace, and amenity of a community that deserves to be heard. Time and again, promises have been made in this region only to be quietly broken after approval, leaving residents to bear the burden of increased noise, traffic, and visual intrusion.

We urge the Council to listen to the voices of the community and to act decisively to safeguard the neighbourhood's future. This proposal, even in its amended form, falls far short of what is acceptable or appropriate for the E3 zone and the surrounding residential area. The Council must prioritise the protection of local amenity and reject this development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards
Houssayn