

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** Sunday, 25 August 2024 7:38 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

25/08/2024

MRS Lisa Reizes  
39 Undercliff RD  
Freshwater NSW 2096

**RE: PEX2024/0005 - 31 Moore Road FRESHWATER NSW 2096**

RE: PEX2024/0005 - 31 Moore Road FRESHWATER NSW 2096

Dear Ms Sio

We are writing to express our objections to and concerns regarding Amendments to the Warringah Local Environment Plan 2011 to support the proposed hotel development at 29-31 Moore Road and 64 Undercliff Road Freshwater NSW 2096.

I would like to ask the council process of notification be considered. There are several challenges which have been noted

- 1) Unless you search specifically for the address of 39 Moore Road no details of this submission come up. It's isn't visible on any of the council maps or lists, this gives the impression that there is no development or changes to the LEP proposed. Given that 64 Undercliff is to change from a residence to a commercial property -shouldn't this proposal be linked to that property as well?
- 2) In the pre-lodgement meeting held 30 September 2020 pg 15 View Sharing was raised specifically to the West of the site - but the council only notified two properties to the west on Undercliff Road, given Council has already raised the issue why wasn't a broader notification zone considered given the impact the Council Staff have already raised?
- 3) On pg17 of the pre-lodgement meeting it says that the 9 Council staff in attendance offered "in principle supports the proposed planning proposal". Given the need for community consultation noted by several staff in this document, and the significant changes to the site, why would Council staff offer "in principle support" without conducting their own consultation with their own residents or elected officials?
- 4) We believe that points 1-3 should be rectified/considered, as a minimum the notification period should be restarted and the Council conduct their own broader community consultation.

We don't believe that the Council should accept the proposed amendments to the planning controls to support a Hotel or other exceptions to the current LEP developments. The Pub gave up their rights to accommodation with the previous DA, now they have their extra restaurants, they are looking to add to the site, rather than do it within the existing building envelope.

Further, while council may support additional uses to the existing site, this shouldn't apply to 64 Undercliff Road. What guarantees will Council give that if 64 Undercliff is incorporated that other blocks could be consolidated (to make the hotel bigger) when the DA is lodged or other consolidation Undercliff Road could occur and they create their own Hotel or different use of building beyond the scope of R2 Residential? We believe that Clause 14 of Schedule 1 of WLEP 2011 should not be modified to include 64 Undercliff Road.

Noise - the Planning Proposal says that "are not considered to result in any adverse acoustic impacts within the existing residential setting." However, this with the proposal provided there would be additional noise from the balconies, the pool and the additional traffic to the site. Noise is currently a large factor with the hotel with

additional guests and more noise on the southern boundary there would be additional noise from Undercliff Road. Also, we have raised the issues with the Hotel of noisy Airconditioning and Exhaust fans that sound like a siren that operate all night - there doesn't seem to have been any effort to address these concerns. Just the air-conditioning for the entire hotel would be a substantial increase in ambient noise to a quiet suburban street.

#### Traffic.

Despite the planning documents insistence that Traffic impact will be minimal, this is not the case. Changes to street parking have already been put in place for the hotel to facilitate hotel operation and patrons - at the expense of residents. The proposed design changes will significantly increase the flow of traffic into Undercliff Road and out of Moore Street. Currently cars can see if the car park is full before they enter the car park, now they will have to drive thru the carpark to try to find a spot, this will cause a constant flow of traffic through the site at all hours.

#### Visual Impact.

We don't believe that the proposed plans compliment the existing development of the site or the street. There is no other solid frontage of a site covering 4 or 5 blocks on Undercliff Road.

#### 24 Hour Economy.

This is mentioned in the proposal - given noise and other issues, we don't believe that this site is suitable to operate as a 24 Hour site.

#### Anzac day

The Hotel has a significant Anzac Day history, with the removal of the Car Park, there is no space for it to be held what is the plan for the future of this event? Is there certainty that there won't be future applications to the Council to leverage the Road for their events, like has been approved for the Diggers?

Council recommendations raised in that initial meeting seem to have been taken at the minimum, the lack of community consultation, the setback of the boundaries and stepped in upper story fronting Undercliff Road.

#### Summary

While the Council wants to encourage accommodation outside of Manly and Palm Beach, we don't believe that the intention of Destination Northern Beaches was to do that in in the middle of an R2 Residential area, far away from major road infrastructure or occasional public transport.

We believe that 64 Undercliff Road should not be incorporated in the proposal, because of the precedence it sets for the rest of the street and potential expansion.

Noise, traffic and pressure on amenities should also be considered when assessing modifying the LEP.

Regards

Lisa and Jordan Reizes