
From: MVRA Pittwater
Sent: 2/06/2025 3:31:55 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: DA 2024/0143 OBJECTION from Mona Vale and District Residents Association
Attachments: MVRA Objection to DA 2025-0143.pdf;

ATTENTION: Brittany Harrison Assessments Planner

Submission attached as a pdf

Regards

Kelvin Auld MPIA

Convenor

Mona Vale and District Residents Association





PO Box 62 Mona Vale NSW 1660

CEO

Northern Beaches Council

Council Chambers

Dee Why

DA 2025/0143 1749-1753 Pittwater Rd Mona Vale

Attention: Brittany Harrison

Mona Vale Residents Association wish to thank Council for the opportunity to make a submission in relation to this development proposal. The association wishes to object to the proposed development in its current form.

Grounds for objection include the following:

- The proposed vehicle ingress and egress via Council's Bagan Lane car-park is not supported. Reference is made to the submission from John Allonson, Strata Committee of SP81458 (1741-1745 Pittwater Rd Mona Vale). The views expressed in the submission attached are supported.
- The significant concerns raised by Council's Design and Sustainability Advisory Panel.
- The significant concerns raised in Council's Traffic Engineering response.
- The loss of commercial office floorspace that is important for the functioning of Mona Vale's mixed use centre.
- Over-development of the site given the physical access constraints.
- Concerns about ensuring that the affordability housing units will be managed for that purpose over 15 years.

Regards

Kelvin Auld MPIA

Urban and Environmental Planner

Convenor

Mona Vale and District Residents Association

27/03/2025

MR John Allanson
2 / 1741 - 1745 Pittwater RD
Mona Vale NSW 2103
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2025/0143 - 1753 Pittwater Road MONA VALE NSW 2103

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: DA 2025/0143 1749 AND 1753 PITTWATER ROAD AND 4 BUNGAN LANE MONA VALE

The Strata Committee of SP81458 have considered parts of above-mentioned proposal.

It is submitted that access to car parking facilities within the proposed development should be denied through the limited access currently available to the land upon which the development is proposed. The present Council car park access and the relevant right of way never contemplated an amplified use of 88 car spaces plus 29 bicycle standing areas and 8 motorcycle areas plus a loading bay.

With respect, the report by Terrafic Pty Limited is erroneous in that the monitoring of traffic entering the Council car park in morning peak and leaving Council car park in the afternoon peak is not accurate.

It should be borne in mind that the development at 1 Mona Vale Road (the Gateway Building) and 1741-1745 Pittwater Road (the Aurora Building) were constructed before the current Council carpark building. Prior to that building being erected, access to the latter two developments were through an open air, easily accessible, ground level only Council carpark. The design and development of the current Council carpark had to take into account that access to 1 Mona Vale and 1741-1745 Pittwater Road had to be provided. At that time, access to 1749 Pittwater Road requirements were minimal.

It is common knowledge that between 4.30pm and 5.45pm on weekdays, two significant traffic jams occur, namely:

1. Vehicles leaving the carparking areas in 1 Mona Vale Road and 1741-1745 Pittwater Road and the Council carpark itself.
2. A traffic jamb occurs at the end of Bungan Lane onto Mona Vale Road as traffic travelling east on Mona Vale Road often banks up to and beyond the Bungan Street T intersection. Obviously this blocks traffic trying to exit out of Bungan Lane onto Mona Vale Road.

The Bungan Lane exit to Mona Vale Road is further burdened by the carparks relating to 20 Bungan Street and 13 Waratah Street. That adds up to 5 significantly large car parks (plus

whatever the proposed development will add) into a one way lane onto a main arterial road!

To suggest (as has been in Terrafic's report) that the proposed development will not have any noticeable or unacceptable effects is, to say the least, erroneous.

Yours faithfully,
On behalf of the Strata Committee SP81458

