

---

**Sent:** 13/11/2020 9:57:32 AM  
**Subject:** I am sharing 'Manly Boat Shed Mike Veysey 12112020' with you  
**Attachments:** Manly Boat Shed Mike Veysey 12112020.doc;

Please advise receipt of this email. Mike Veysey.

[mikeveysey@gmail.com](mailto:mikeveysey@gmail.com)

# MIKEVEYSEYCONSULTING

making things happen

**ABN 26163812673**

Mike Veysey – Principal  
52 Albany Road Stanmore, NSW 2048  
Mobile: 0412 264 985  
mikeveysey@gmail.com  
Mike Veysey Consulting Pty Ltd

12 November 2020

Chief Executive Officer  
Northern Beaches Council

[council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au](mailto:council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au)  
[anne-marie.young@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au](mailto:anne-marie.young@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au)

Dear Chief Executive Officer,

**RE: Manly Boatshed DA 2020/0514  
1B Bolingbroke Parade, Fairlight**

I have been engaged by residents affected by this development. In forming my opinions I have reviewed the following:-

1. The Traffic and Parking Peer Review by McLaren Traffic Engineering dated 29 October, 2020 (the McLaren Report).
2. The SEE filed with the DA documents
3. The Traffic Impact Statement (TIA) by Traffix
4. Letter from the Council to the applicant dated 3 September, 2020
5. The letter from Planning Ingenuity to the Council dated 18 September, 2020 (the Response).

I agree with the analysis and conclusions of the McLaren Report, and in particular with the conclusion that the TIA is not a robust or credible analysis of the parking and traffic impacts of the proposed development. The failure to address the imminent withdrawal of the parking permits on which the Boatshed has historically relied (which according to RTA/RMS/TfNSW guidelines should not have been granted some years ago), is particularly problematic, as is the

failure to apply engineering principles to the calculation of overall parking and traffic effects of the existing and new development.

There has, for instance been no attempt made to apply well established guidelines such as the RTA Guidelines to Traffic Generating Developments and no attempt to understand the impact of the 'kiosk'. This operation is clearly not ancillary and will generate parking and traffic loads. It is well known that such operations in iconic scenic locations generate significant parking and traffic loads. I am also troubled by the assertion that the 'kiosk' will be operated by 2 part-time university students from 6am to 10pm each day. Given the term of the foreshadowed lease is 40 years, and that such operations are commonly sub-let or licensed to experienced commercial operators such as Ripples or the Merivale group, I do not believe Council can rely on the statement of intention to operate the kiosk in-house in a low key manner.

In addition, neither the TIA nor the Response has addressed the requirements of the Sydney Harbour Foreshores Area Development Control Plan (2005) which clearly applies to the site, and which at 4.7 specifies the following:-

*Traffic and Parking:*

- *land-based impacts including traffic volumes and parking demand meet established performance standards;*
- *adequate car and trailing parking (based on the number and type of berths, associated activities and number of employees) is to be available on-site. Off-site parking is acceptable only where it will not reduce community amenity or generate adverse traffic impacts; and*
- *the adverse impacts of traffic and parking generated by boat storage facilities in terms of congestion, safety, air quality and noise are to be minimised.*

The significance of the first and second bullet points in particular is quite obvious, in the situation which exists on the site which provides no on-site parking and is incapable of doing so, and the immediate area is the subject of a parking scheme designed to protect the amenity of residents and where severe constraints are already consistently reported.

The site will generate a parking load of up to 51 spaces and considerable extra traffic movements from early in the morning until late at night. Only 3 parking permits appear likely to be granted to the applicant under the new parking scheme which is in place and will be enforced from 1 March, 2020. The assertion that vehicle movements in relation to deliveries and servicing will not increase is not credible, especially as all food is apparently to be delivered pre-packaged so significant extra waste will be generated. Deliveries will also need to occur. In these circumstances this DA can not be supported on traffic engineering grounds.

I am also surprised to see that the entire operation of the site, which is zoned 'special purposes (boat repair facilities and commercial marinas)' and W2 Environmental Protection, under the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 is a prohibited use under clause 18 of that SREP, and is only able to be approved under the special provision in clause 34(2). That special provision is of course limited by the objects of the clause set out in ss(1), which include that the scale of the facilities and intensity of use of the site are not substantially increased by the development. It seems to me that both the scale of the facilities and intensity of use of the site will indeed substantially increase with the

**Mike Veysey Consulting Pty Ltd** – PO BOX 131 Westgate NSW 2048

Telephone – 0412 264 985 Email – [mikeveysey@gmail.com](mailto:mikeveysey@gmail.com) [www.mikeveyseyconsulting.com.au](http://www.mikeveyseyconsulting.com.au)

proposed development so that the provision in ss(2) is not available to the applicant. The result is that Council has no power of approval under Clause 34(2); the proposed uses being otherwise prohibited. Further, any expansion of prohibited uses is undesirable in the extreme, and would subvert the clear policy aims of the SREP.

On behalf of affected local residents, I ask council to refuse this DA.

Yours faithfully

Mike Veysey

BE, MEng Sci (Traffic and Transport), CPEng, FIE Aust