
Sent: 26/03/2021 11:10:29 AM
Subject: Online Submission

26/03/2021

MR John Koorey
36 - Manly Bower ST
MANLY NSW 2095
kooreyjohn@hotmail.com

RE: DA2021/0179 - 255 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093

Dear Sirs,

I respond to development 255 Condamine Street Manly Vale. DA 2021/0179

I have viewed the plans and read much of the application.

I submit as the owner of southern and rear adjoining properties along with further properties in the locality. I state that in our almost fifty years of progressing all these properties we have indeed complied with and met all council requirements and conditions pertaining to height limits, parking and open space. We have in this time built and retained our developments, employed many in local business's and paid all taxes and rates assessed.

The original Freedom Furniture building has been established for over forty years, this site is from 247 to 253 Condamine Street and is inclusive of traffic light access.

Parking and Traffic

The parking and traffic situation is of grave concern, having experienced the growth of the area along with losing by resumption enough land from our site to allow two lanes of the Expressway, the continual reduction of parking and growth of traffic within the area must be given full attention.

It is fact that all side streets are being impacted by extra vehicle's in the area, Pitt Street residents have already lost the ability to park outside their own homes. There is no parking available in Kenneth Road, there is nowhere else for parking except our site at 247 - 253 Condamine Street. The knowledge that access of the Freedom Furniture site gives close access and return via traffic lights to south bound vehicles is of concern. Fear that the driveway will via the footpath have vehicles crossing to enter the Freedom exit and continue travel by this site.

On the other side of the road clients etc of the Gym etc already park for short periods when the likes of Snooze and Bing Lee are closed, there can also be some interruptions during daytime as customers rush for their quick orders from the paint shop or cake shop across the road, they always state they are indeed sorry but they will only be a minute when confronted.

With 39 Bed Rooms being supplied and basically no parking we can only expect the worst for our site. Security of our site has never been of concern, we have complied with Council requirements and supplied well over 100 parking spaces in the area.

Vehicles already coming to work on site at 255 are parking at 253. Upon completion it would be a brave person to suggest there will not be problems. In excess of 80 people on site and no visitor parking, 7 car parks to supply the whole site, problems again for the whole district. No visitor or service vehicle parking, food delivery and truck access. The adjoining block at the rear has two houses, seven people reside in a same size block that is now going to cater for over 80 people. This is supposed to fit in with the local area, I don't think so. This whole development gives new meaning to overcrowding.

Regarding the Proposal:

Of extreme importance to us is for the need of effective column placement in enclosing and or interfering with the creek flow. Having experienced severe flooding in the past we object to any

building works being carried out above the creek without modelling and regard to falling trees etc from upstream causing major blockage. In the time of our ownership we have witnessed a changing eroding landscape, we have had two major inundations and two or three other very close calls with floodwaters. Much of this caused by the building of the Expressway along with the straightening of the creek and vegetation blockage's at 255 Condamine Street, further development throughout the district has increased flow and the works required to rectify have been substantial in the reserve at the rear. Erosion damage is evident after every heavy downpour. Concern is the creek banks etc under the ground floor concrete slab. This area must be kept clear to allow access and clearing of falling trees and flowing vegetation. The bulk of the southern wall overshadows our property at 253 voiding the use of the solar panels on the roof of that property, these have been installed by the tenant at a large cost. There is no setback on the southern boundary. The application before you gives nothing but a huge solid wall with no air or light relief for the almost the full length of that block and the length of our north boundary.

The rear of the development creates eight tenancies all overlooking the house at the rear of 12 Pitt Street, the report suggests only one house on this block but there are two with seven occupants.

I look for understanding of Affordable Housing, I see nothing in regards of how pricing and occupants will be selected or what qualifies as affordable. It is important to stress the site history, it was a two bedroom house occupied by a family. It sold to a TV repair and operated as The Colour Box TV repairs for many years.

With the advent of Bulky Goods retail establishing in the area, Freedom Furniture was the first, others followed to where the area today has a multitude of bulky goods retailers. This site applied to council for rezoning, sought and got approval to build a furniture showroom with a dwelling in the upper section, basically your Shop Top as of today.

Building works commenced and the dwelling situated there today is uncompleted abandoned works from those approvals.

Having been a supporter of the development at 257-259 Condamine Street, being delighted that something of style and substance was further improving the area, I am now disappointed in that this site neglected for so long, looking good from the outside but an absolute can of worms for the area and the adjoining properties when investigated.

How we can justify the placing of human beings in such a confined prison cell type environment, to even consider this as humane is beyond belief. I travel regularly to China, I have seen similar developments in factory accommodations with their having advantage of open balconies for air and light.

As a reminder the development at 261 Condamine Street is of similar size, it however has if I recall correctly twenty two one bedroom dwellings. It also meets the requirement of Shop top dwellings.

This whole development is to be condemned, it is too bulky, is overcrowded, lacks concern for local community and needs input from local residents and land owners.

The application has been the growth of continual attempt of profiteering. As each new owner comes on board the applications keep growing to more grandiose developments, most fitting for the area surely needs to be the earlier approval for a shop top housing showroom development as already started. As an established property holder in the area we seek protection from confrontation and invasion of our own properties as we have always enjoyed.

Yours faithfully,

John Koorey