
Sent: 1/02/2020 3:54:06 PM
Subject: Online Submission

01/02/2020

MR John Williams
238 Warringah RD
BEacon Hill NSW 2100
mejaywee@optusnet.com.au

RE: DA2019/1480 - 242 Warringah Road BEACON HILL NSW 2100

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in opposition to the proposed development of a 13 room boarding house at 242 Warringah Road, Beacon Hill (DA2019/4080).

As a Beacon Hill resident, home owner and parent, I feel strongly that this development would be detrimental to our neighbourhood.

I have a long list of significant concerns with the proposal to replace a single occupancy residential property with a three story, multi occupancy boarding house on an 883m2 block.

Firstly there are major Safety concerns.

Primary of these is the situation of the entry and exit driveway to a 13 dwelling complex carpark being situated at the crest of Ellis Road as it enters the extremely busy intersection of Warringah Road. The repeatedly inaccurate Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment claims "Ellis Road at this location is relatively straight and the sight distance in relation to site access movements is adequate". This is entirely erroneous as it disregards the blind crest created by the considerable slope of Ellis Road as well as disregarding turning traffic entering Ellis Road from the 70km/h major roadway just meters from the proposed driveway.

Additionally the site is not serviced by a footpath and rectification of the uneven, rocky, and raised-root riddled verge is not included in the DA. This presents a safety concern to proposed residents, their guests and service personnel.

Secondly there are significant concerns with Parking Congestion.

The Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment again erroneously suggest "service personnel and visitors etc. will be reliant on the available on-street parking in Ellis Road and Warringah Road." However, there is none! Yellow curb markings both sides down Ellis Road and a 6am - 7pm (9am-6pm weekend) Clearway 7 days per week on Warringah Road will instead drive parking stress to Earl Street, Oxford Falls Road, Dareen Street etc. These streets are not only quite distant from the proposed development, and thus not particularly convenient, but are also narrow and over stressed by residents already affected by the aforementioned parking restrictions on Ellis and Warringah Roads. Furthermore, Earl Street and Oxford Falls Road are both relatively busy for vehicular traffic which is often confined to single file.

Additionally, due to the irregular requirements of such a development, there will only be 6 car spaces on site for up to 24 adults. Excess parking driven into these narrow neighbouring side

streets causes further safety concerns for traffic flow and unfairly restricts parking available to residents of these streets.

Thirdly, I have important Community Interest concerns.

The proposed development is entirely incongruent and incompatible with the character of local area. Beacon Hill is a suburb of single dwelling homes, which are very often single story. The proposed three story monstrosity in no way maintains this character.

Moreover, the nature of the proposed development, a boarding house of 13 dual occupancy units of which 12 are short stay 'affordable housing bedsits' is entirely different to the current neighbourhood, a family-orientated, quiet community comprised almost exclusively of single dwelling, detached, traditional homes characterised by landscaped settings that are in harmony with the natural environment.

Add to this the fact that the proposed building comprises three stories when the neighbourhood is largely comprised of "traditional single dwellings" (Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment - Page 2 section 2.1). This boarding house is not in keeping with the low-density residential council zoning which dictates all other developments in the neighbourhood.

All in all, it is clear that the proposed development is inconsistent with the provisions of clause 30A of State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 - being the character of the local area. Clause 30A of the SEPP states: 'A consent authority must not consent to development to which this Division applies unless it has taken into consideration whether the design of the development is compatible with the character of the local area'. In the context of our R2 residential zone - a low density residential environment characterised by landscaped settings that are in harmony with the natural environment. Thus, this development with a bulk and scale similar to residential flat buildings or townhouses is entirely different in scale and setback to the surrounding detached dwelling houses. Surely then, by this fact alone, the development is unacceptable.

Further, I have grave concerns regarding Traffic Congestion.

As you well know, Warringah Road is a major state road and significant thoroughfare. Importantly, the Warringah/Government/Ellis Road intersection is a very significant one in the flow of traffic heading to Dee Why, Brookvale, Allambie Heights, Oxford Falls and Forestville areas. Additional strain and congestion on the Warringah/Ellis/Government Roads intersection during peak hours through the use of a potentially busy driveway right on the intersection will negatively impact traffic flows along Warringah road, Government Road, Ellis Road, Oxford Falls Road and Iris Street.

The position of this development on the intersection of these major traffic arteries is already problematic. Add to this the cumulative effects of the proposed meatworks road development (DA2019/1340) which would see significant numbers of trucks using Ellis, Iris and Oxford Falls Roads over the next 3 years. The prognosis is bleak for local and through traffic and residents.

Additionally, I note significant issues associated with geotechnical concerns for neighbouring properties and roadways.

When considering the significant excavations proposed for this development, the Geotechnical and Landslip Assessment - revised, clearly states that "the adjacent houses are likely to be founded on rock. Buildings bearing on rock can be highly susceptible to damage from

vibrations when rock excavations are made in the immediate vicinity." As the owner of one of the neighbouring houses (238 Warringah Road), this is very concerning.

As well as detailing the excavations methods and conditions least likely to cause such damage, the report goes on to state that "It is extremely difficult to definitively predict the effect of the above type of excavation on adjacent buildings and structures" (of which Warringah Road is surely one) and that "There have been many cases in Sydney where predictions based on experience or the above relationships have been proved inaccurate, and adjacent structures have been damaged. For these reasons the following comments should only be taken as a guide".

To approve such a development adjoining a major intersection on Warringah Road and adjacent to many local homes is preposterous.

Additional to the above major concerns I note the issues raised in the Engineering Referral Response. Significant issues regarding unacceptable stormwater provisions and sub-surface seepage are clearly noted. Moreover, the report condemns the lack of detail regarding pedestrian pathways on Ellis Road and notes the significant site constraints limiting such construction.

In the same vain, I question the impact of the significant increase in shadowing on neighbouring property caused by the proposed development. The Development Application drawings clearly show heavy shadowing on 240 Warringah Road from 3pm onward and there is no indication of any similar issues for No. 3 Ellis Road. This infringement on the properties of neighbours greatly impacts their quality of life and limits the ability of residents to employ solar electrical or heating technologies now or in the future.

Similarly, the Environmental Health Referral Response raises important questions regarding the impact of light and noise from the proposed development, another unacceptable infringement on the daily lives of local residents. The author deems the issue significant enough to recommend conditions and restrictions be imposed. I raise the question of how the policing of such conditions and restrictions will be carried out to overcome environmental health issues raised. This policing will need to be maintained well into the future, even after the restriction period for individual sale of units has elapsed.

Similarly, the Acoustic Assessment linked to the DA imposes numerous sanctions such as Outdoor area not being in used between 10.00pm and 7.00am, a maximum of 13 residents allowed at any time in the outdoor communal area, and one in two residents in conversation in the outdoor (50% of 13 residents) communal area. The question to ask again is how will this be policed and by whom? Furthermore, it seems inaccurate to base figures on the least number of residents (13) when there could in fact be two residents per unit which, including the managers unit, would total 26 adults. At this rate, someone needs to police only one in 4 residents talking in outdoor areas at once. What a naïve and unachievable idea!

In a similar vein, the report states that "male normal vocal effort has been considered as a typical worst case for normal conversation within a small social gathering environment". This seems to be an unlikely "worst case" scenario at a social gathering at a boarding house - have they considered the voice required to be heard over music, other residents and alcohol?

I suggest that this Acoustic report needs reassessment.

Importantly, the situation of this boarding house with minimal onsite parking is not well

considered as it is not located on a major public transport network. Despite being situated on a state road and adjoining the Warringah Road bus stop, the only public transport available is the limited suburban bus line on Warringah road Beacon Hill (169/E69, E60 & 173) and relies on the Oxford Falls bus stop (136 & 193). Being suburban lines, rather than major transport networks, whilst these stops are heavily used by school students, buses are irregular and unreliable for the majority of the day and all but non-existent at night. This is not a logical location for a boarding house given the wealth of more suitable alternatives fed by major transport services such as the new B-line.

Finally, I draw to your attention a number of inaccuracies and untruths documented in the transport and traffic planning report as well as the Development Application itself. These inaccuracies include, but are not limited to:

Development Application:

- Page 2 lists the number of existing dwellings as 2. All other reports included in the documentation list it as one dwelling and, as a resident for 13 years who has been to the property numerous times, I can confirm that there is only one legal dwelling on the property. I do not believe the garage at the South West corner of the house has ever been legally converted to a separate dwelling and remains a garage.

Geotechnical & Landslip Report:

- Page 7 suggests "If the recommendations made in this report are followed then adequate protection and support will be provided for adjacent properties" which contradicts its earlier statement which states on page 4 that "the adjacent houses are likely to be founded on rock. Buildings bearing on rock can be highly susceptible to damage from vibrations when rock excavations are made in the immediate vicinity." And that "It is extremely difficult to definitively predict the effect of the above type of excavation on adjacent buildings and structures. There are various relations available that have been used to carry out such predictions, but these do not easily take account of the natural variability of rock such as Hawkesbury Sandstone. There have been many cases in Sydney where predictions based on experience or the above relationships have been proved inaccurate, and adjacent structures have been damaged. For these reasons the following comments should only be taken as a guide"

The Plans (copies in many attached reports):

- The property at 240 Warringah Road is shown repeatedly as a 2 story weatherboard house. This is the immediately neighbouring property and suits the developer well to suggest 2 stories as this DA is attempting to pass a 3 story development. In fact 240 Warringah comprises of a split level home which follows the natural rock contour. Both levels of the home are single story. A three story development is entirely out of keeping with the existing and established architecture of the neighbourhood.

The Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment:

- On Page 4 (section 3.1), the description of Warringah Road as having "3 traffic lanes in each direction with central median island" which ignores the presence of the dedicated Right Hand Turning Lanes in both the Western and Easterly directions.
- On Page 4 (section 3.2) erroneously lists Warringah Road as having "NO PARKING (6.30am - 9.30am, 3.30pm - 6.30pm Mon - Fri)". In reality, this section of Warringah Road maintains a 6am - 7pm Clearway Monday - Friday and a 9am - 6pm Clearway on weekends. Similarly, the report mentions the "NO PARKING and BUS ZONE restrictions along the eastern frontage of Ellis Road", but fails to acknowledge the NO PARKING restrictions on the Western Frontage.
- On Page 5 (Section 3.2) the report is again incorrect when it states that the speed restriction

on this section of Warringah Road as being 60km/h when it is in fact 70km/h.

- On Page 5 (Section 3.3) the report states that "flows along Oxford Falls Road are generally free flowing" which as anyone who travels these roads in peak hour will confirm, is incorrect.
- On Page 8 (section 6.1) the report claims that "Ellis Road at this location is relatively straight and the sight distance in relation to site access movements is adequate." Which fails to acknowledge the location of the driveway they are referring to for entry and egress at the crest of a blind hill.
- On Page 8 (section 6.3) the report blindly suggests that "Service personnel and visitors etc. will be reliant on the available on-street parking in Ellis Road and Warringah Road." As has been clearly demonstrated, there is none, making this statement and associated judgements of adequate parking facilitation inaccurate and worthless.
- Finally, the report fails to acknowledge the proximity of the only driveway entry and exit point to the very busy, light controlled intersection of Warringah Road and Government/Ellis Roads. The fact that the proposed 7 car, 3 motorcycle and 2 bicycle parking lot's driveway enters into a dedicated left turning lane within 30-40 metres of the intersection is extremely important and makes the report's conclusions that the development will "not present any unsatisfactory traffic capacity, safety or environmental related implications" entirely false (even without all of the afore mentioned mistakes and inaccuracies which all serve to do the same!)

Surely such inaccuracies, easily found with only a cursory read, should deem these supporting documents inadequate for the purpose of sanctioning such a major development?

As you will see from this submission and the scores of others, this development is not in keeping with the existing community, architecture or council zoning requirements; poses serious safety concerns; will lead to significant traffic and parking difficulties and contains many environmental and engineering concerns. The community opposes this development for very good reason.

It should be pointed out, too, that this is not a 'Not In My Backyard' (NIMBY) campaign. The neighbourhood already support an established 'Affordable Rental Housing' block on the very same intersection (on the Western side of Ellis Road). Two high-density, 'affordable' rental complexes at the same location simply exacerbates all the issues already noted.

Make no mistake, allowing this development is a dangerous precedent in our wonderful community. This proposal is not a philanthropic attempt to assist the needy with affordable accommodation. It is another blatant exploitation of the SEPP by a property developer looking to maximise returns with regard for neither communities nor the disadvantaged.

I trust that you will follow due diligence and decline the current development application for a 13 unit boarding house at 242 Warringah Road Beacon Hill.

Yours sincerely,

John Williams