
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 31/05/2025 12:47:37 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Online Submission

31/05/2025

MS Jessica Hermosilla
38 - 38 Dudley ST
Balgowlah NSW 2093
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2025/0132 - 37 Roseberry Street BALGOWLAH NSW 2093

Dear Assessing Planner,

I am writing as a long-term resident of Balgowlah on the Northern Beaches, where I have lived for the past 18 years, and as a parent of two children living with disabilities, to express my strong opposition to the amended Development Application DA2024/0448.

Despite the changes submitted in the latest iteration of the application, I believe the proposal remains unsuitable for this location-on both practical and community grounds. As someone who has contributed to this area for nearly two decades and pays rates to the Council, I am deeply concerned by the lack of genuine responsiveness to public feedback in the revised plans.

1. A Poor Fit-No Amendments Can Fix the Inherent Incompatibility

The proposed development by McDonald's does not belong at this site-full stop. Regardless of operational tweaks or facade redesigns, this type of high-traffic, high-turnover commercial outlet is fundamentally misaligned with the surrounding residential environment.

Currently, the tenancy generates little traffic, and yet this junction remains one of the most consistently congested in the area. A fast-food venue will inevitably increase vehicle volume, noise, and pollution, exacerbating conditions that are already under strain. Minor adjustments to layouts or access points cannot change this outcome.

This proposal doesn't just fail to respond to the character of the area-it works actively against it.

2. Overbearing Form and Out-of-Place Scale

The design, even with the latest modifications, continues to exceed height expectations and overwhelms the streetscape. The bulk and scale of the building are disproportionate to its surroundings. These visual impacts are not softened by minor architectural changes. The result is still a dominant, commercial massing that sits uncomfortably within the built form of nearby residences.

3. Mental Health, Privacy, and Sensory Intrusion

The latest revisions do not resolve the clear issues of privacy and overlooking. Sightlines from the development continue to intrude into private homes and gardens, while the structure itself obstructs natural views and sunlight. This is not simply a matter of design aesthetics-the right

to privacy and comfort in one's home is directly tied to individual mental health and wellbeing.

There is strong evidence that disruptions to the home environment-particularly loss of natural light, increased noise, visual dominance, and ongoing disturbance-can have serious psychological effects. This is especially true for individuals living with disabilities, including those with sensory processing conditions, anxiety disorders, PTSD, or autism.

For people who are neurodivergent or living with disability, sudden changes to their environment, excessive sensory input, or loss of control over their living space can be deeply destabilising. What may seem tolerable to the general population can, for others, be overwhelming and functionally disabling.

The construction phase alone will introduce sustained noise, vibration, odours, and visual disruption. Once operational, a commercial venue of this scale will continue to impose sensory stressors-bright lighting, drive-through activity, waste disposal, and vehicle noise. These are not temporary or occasional issues; they represent an enduring and cumulative burden on the mental and physical health of residents-particularly those most vulnerable.

This impact on people with disability has not been acknowledged in any meaningful way in the application materials, and it must be considered in the planning assessment process.

4. Traffic and Parking Reassurances Are Misleading

The traffic analysis in the updated application still downplays the real-world conditions already experienced by locals. We do not need to wait for predictive models-we see the effects every day.

Adding a 24/7 or high-volume takeaway operation to an area already gridlocked at peak times is not just unwise-it is unfair to those who rely on safe and timely access, including children, cyclists, and pedestrians.

Parking overflow into residential streets is also inevitable, and no current mitigation plan meaningfully accounts for that.

5. Sustainability Claims Do Not Hold Up to Scrutiny

The language used in the application to describe sustainability commitments strikes me as disingenuous. In my view, these are surface-level statements aimed at approval, not a reflection of meaningful environmental intent.

It is not enough to use efficient fittings and recycled materials when the larger brand operation generates immense volumes of waste and emissions. The McDonald's supply chain-from intensive farming to packaging waste and freight logistics-is not consistent with the environmental values of this community. This issue cannot be addressed with planter boxes or solar panels on a drive-through.

6. Ongoing Non-Compliance with Planning Intent

Even after revision, the application still departs from key planning rules, particularly around height, setbacks, and land use. There is insufficient justification for these departures, and no clear benefit to the broader community.

Council's planning instruments exist for a reason-to protect both the natural and built

character of our neighbourhoods. Making exceptions for developments like this erodes that framework.

In Closing

This development is not wanted by the community and does not serve the long-term interest of the area. No volume of amendments can mask the fact that this is the wrong project in the wrong place. As a long-standing local, I urge the Council to uphold its responsibility to protect residential amenity, community wellbeing, and planning integrity by rejecting DA2024/0448.

Best,
Jessica Hermosilla