
From: Maree Portanger [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 14 October 2024 2:11 PM
To: Planning Panels - Northern Beaches
Subject: Planning Panel Submission RE PEX2024/0005 Harbord Hotel (HH)

Categories: NBLPP

Thank You to the Panel for their time.

I would like to express my concerns regarding the Councils assessment of the proposal by HH to alter the WLEP2011 to include a Motel and extend this to 64 Undercliff Road a residential property providing housing to people who will be left looking for another place to live should this be allowed during a Housing shortage. This Council has dismissed the real concerns of the Community who have spent an enormous amount of time researching and providing serious concerns regarding this proposal which extend well beyond the very important Infrastructure/Antisocial Behaviour/Amenity concerns to the fact that there is nothing binding by the applicant in this application (I would draw the panels attention to the OATES submission) and the fact that there is no expert evidence to support and benefit to the community or the local economy (i would draw the Panels attention to the FIELD submission).

The council appears to be trying to rush through approval of this application for HH without addressing Community concerns and even the concerns of their own officers.

1, The Environmental Health officer does have concerns which were expressed in the pre meeting - concerns with the fact that this Motel was to be used as part of the HH Live Music Business and told the HH they should consult with neighbours which did not happen and in fact I think the inclusion of a elevated outdoor pool in the Artist Impression illustrates that the applicant in not interested in the quality of live of the Freshwater Community. What is proposed by HH is not a few Holiday lets, it is about a large Conference/Function/Live Music centre up to 800 people in the middle of a Residential Area which has strong infrastructure restrictions.

2. The Council's Engineer does not support the project due to Stormwater concerns (unacceptable impacts) but the Council is just brushing aside their concerns basically saying we will sort it out later. We are talking about excavating down two levels in a landslip area which is prone to flooding in the Basin.

3, The Transport officer apparently does not have significant concerns as says that Compared to the traffic generated by the Hotel the Motel is not a significant concern which is Hardly helpful given the Council approved the expansion of the HH and the second level is yet to open which is no doubt why the Council and HH are trying to push this through. Council what about the ever increasing number of large Trucks using every feeder street - I saw a Keg delivery Truck reverse down Charles St park in the driveway and roll Kegs down the Footpath to the delivery point (so much for the 10 minute zone).

In addition a few more thoughts -

1. In DA2021/1620 by HH the Panel included a few conditions that would have helped preserve the amenity of the residential community i.e. no acoustic music to be heard in other boundaries after

10pm and reduced numbers i.e. 650 instead of the now 750 to 800 among others. The HH appealed these conditions and because the Council Lawyers were instructed to offer no defence (no expert evidence by council) the judge upheld the HH appeal. I am concerned that the Council will follow the same pattern should this be approved - clearly they appear to have little regard to the Amenity of Residents anymore or for that matter visitors.

2. Benefits to Local Business I think is doubtful given the Council has approved many developments along Lawrence and Albert Street which have led to 100s more residents - if the Council is saying a 37 Room Motel will make any real difference I think it is unlikely but it may take Business away from the other local Business.

3. Freshwater is not part of the 24HR Economy so the Councils comments about this are irrelevant it is a Residential area which enables other Land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of Residents (from the Judge in Land and Enviro Court) a Conference/Function/Live Music Venue is not really in this category.

4, I am very concerned that the Council is not interested in the Malicious damage (often to Council's own property) and the anti social behaviour caused by the Patrons leaving the HH as if the HH owners can not manage their Business in a way that does not adversely impact on residents then they should not be considered appropriate people to Manage a Motel 24Hr a day.

As a long term Resident I know people have always come to Freshwater for 3 Reasons:

- 1, The Safe Family Beach and Park
2. The Village Atmosphere including the Local shops
- 3, Safe place for Families at night (prior to being saturated by Alcohol).

The Residents have always kept the Locals Businesses providing great goods and services afloat in the quiet times.

Sleeping is a Basic Human right and causes serious health issues if over time it is interrupted and limited. The Hotel noise is all day and does not end a close of business by continues into the night - with this proposed Motel the noise will never end and neither will the Carbon Dioxide and other smells from the underground parking and delivery area which will be extracted out by exhausts into the atmosphere.

I ask the Panel to recommend this application by HH be rejected and no new applications for Changes to WLEP or Rezoning be allowed for 2 years in order for the community to assess whether the HH Hotel manages the current expansion to Function live music venue.

Thankyou
Maree Portanger