
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 3/11/2021 12:46:28 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

03/11/2021

MR Cameron Lanceley
12 Eastbank AVE
Collaroy NSW 2097

RE: DA2021/1805 - 4 Alexander Street COLLAROY NSW 2097

DA2021/1805, for 4 Alexander Street, Collaroy.

Att. Adam Mitchell.

Dear Adam,

Below are some points I'd like to ask Council to consider for this DA, which is being proposed under the State government regulations for Seniors and Disabled Housing.

The area is zoned R2 and designated as "low density residential" with a maximum height limit of 8.5m. The SEPP requirements indicate height to be under 8M.

In his covering letter to the neighbours the developer says "Building height compliance is 8M", but in the details of the plans it shows the 8M height limit is apparently for the ceiling height for the top floor.

When working with the RL data supplied, it appears the overall height of the building, which includes the lift overrun and the acoustic barriers for the A/C units brings the actual height to 10.5m, 2m over the maximum height allowed for R2, and 2.5M over SEPP requirements. To my way of thinking, as the building in its current proposed form can not comply for Seniors/disabled use without an accessible lift, the actual and real height of the building should be noted as 10.5m not 8m as claimed by the developer.

This development will be obvious in our line of view, and in my opinion the neighbours deserve the right to have height poles installed on site to show the 8M maximum permissible for SEPP allowed developments, and 8.5m for R2 developments and other poles or markers installed to show the actual proposed height of the development, including the installations on top of the building.

I note the developer has already anticipated opposition to his exceeding both the height limits and number of storeys by providing documentation from Boston Blythe Flemming with a Clause 4.6 variation request, which indicates the developer never intended to abide with the regulations governing R2 or SEPP development.

There is a discrepancy in the BASIX information supplied regarding car parking spaces. In the "DA2021/1805 - Plans - BASIX Stamped" information provided by the developer it shows 5 units with 9 car parking spaces, but further down in the provided documents "DA2021/1805 - Report - BASIX Certificate", the number of car parking spaces is stated as 8.

There is also no provision provided for off street parking for visitors or trades vehicles. I see from the plans, in the secure basement there are parking spaces in each secure garage for

each unit, but those spaces are marked as disabled parking spaces, with the necessary space around them for compliance for disabled parking. Do they meet the need of parking for casual visitors or trades?

According to access car parking requirements parallel parking; AS2890.6 clause 2.2.2(a) states that a parallel disabled car park space size is required to be a minimum of 3200mm wide and 5400mm long. The plans show the proposed width of the parking bays but not the length. As the proposal shows the disabled car spaces in the garages nose to tail, in real terms it would be very impractical for disabled residents to have to negotiate the maneuvering to allow access for the inner most car.

Alexander Street is a narrow street, with traffic having to turn into driveways to allow for passing vehicles and with no parking at the eastern end of the street due to its proximity to the Pittwater Rd junction.

To add 5 extra residential units in place of one residence (which had ample off street parking,) with no allowance for off street visitor parking seems to add to the already difficult traffic conditions experienced in Alexander Street instead of mitigating it.

I ask Council to take into account State Environment planning policy (Housing for Seniors or people with a Disability) Part 4 Development standards to be complied with :
division 1 General. 40. 1, 4a, 4b and 4c regarding height.

I see there are a number of "raised planters over a slab" included in the landscape plan, and many of them have a size measurement noted, but not all of them. I read in one of the design regulation sections (that I have not been able to relocate!) that planters are not to be included when working out the percentage of landscape for a development.

Thanks for considering my comments.
Cameron Lanceley