
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 23/08/2024 1:58:50 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

23/08/2024

MRS Anna Supierz
68 Undercliff RD
freshwater NSW 2096

RE: PEX2024/0005 - 31 Moore Road FRESHWATER NSW 2096

David and Anna Supierz
68 Undercliff Road
Freshwater NSW 2096

20 August 2024

Dear Ms Sio

RE: Planning Proposal 29-31 Moore Road and 64 Undercliff Road Freshwater NSW 2096

We write to express our objections to and concern regarding the proposal hotel development at 29-31 Moore Road and 64 Undercliff Road Freshwater NSW 2096.

We endorse the sentiment and the specifics in the letters received to date that oppose the development

1. Incompatible with zoning and the character of the area

This area is zoned R2 residential. It is inappropriate to allow hotel accommodation on the site amongst residential homes. Moreover 64 Undercliff Road has no "additional permitted use" and so if this is allowed on that site what next? Any residential block can just decide to be a hotel?

The recent expansion of the Harbord Hotel has had benefits and also negative impacts on the local neighbourhood driven by the increased patronage generally and the demographic the venue now attracts. We do not need to add to this with hotel accommodation.

There is no need for hotel accommodation in Freshwater. There is plenty of accommodation for visitors in Manly.

Freshwater is loved for its relaxed, family friendly vibe. This development would undercut that tone in our community. We have a commercial precinct in the village. There is no need to create another commercial zone close to the beach.

2. Pressure on amenities

Coupled with the previous developments at the Harbord Hotel, this proposal will increase the patronage to the hotel. Undercliff Road and neighbouring streets are already parked out on sunny days, there is insufficient public transport to support the proposal and it will exacerbate current problems with patrons in the area.

3. Privacy and infringement on our homes

This development would overlook our backyard at No 68 and there is a lack of specificity regarding the landscaping. The inclusion of dense, tall trees on the perimeter is necessary, but would still not be sufficient to negate the impact on our privacy.

The hotel, and the inclusion of a pool/cafe zone will generate noise which will impinge on our peaceful enjoyment of our homes. This is a quiet, family area, not a commercial party zone.

3. Specific design concerns

a. Pedestrian access onto Undercliff Road seems unnecessary and to encourage foot traffic down Undercliff Road. This is already a problem. The street does not even have a footpath to cater for existing foot traffic. In addition, patrons are noisy and leave rubbish, urinate and occasionally vomit outside our homes. We do not need to add to this problem.

b. The design is visually offensive on the street front given how imposing it is. It will be an eyesore.

c. The setback is too short at 3.5m and would add to the imposing facade. Most homes in the street are modest not imposing as the submission suggests.

d. The building is too tall and the monolithic nature of the structure unsightly and not in keeping with either the area or the heritage character of the Harbour Hotel building.

e. Balconies need to be removed from the Hotel design. We already hear the noise in the outdoor areas, which would be compounded by accommodation. The noise will carry through the basin and will disturb residents throughout the basin, particularly those like us in close proximity. These are the same reasons the pub has the double doors to block noise.

4. Lack of due process

There are a number of significant issues with the process being adopted for consideration of this proposal, including:

a. Despite being only one house away from the development site, we were not advised of this proposal by Council but instead by our neighbours. Given the scale of the development, its direct impact on our property and its implications for the character of the community, this is outrageous. See below the view from our backyard to the building to be demolished.

This is the building to be demolished as seen from our backyard. If this proposal is approved, there will be balconies here. And yet, we were left off the distribution list. This is a serious failure of due process.

b. A proposal of this nature which has implications for the whole of Freshwater and

widespread community engagement is necessary. This feedback needs to be invited and considered before a decision can be made. There has been insufficient time allowed for feedback and not enough people know. The submission deadline should be extended to allow more community members to have their view shared,

c. Moreover, it was very difficult to find the proposal on Council's website. Indeed, the first time we went to look for it, we could not find the proposal at all.

d. The hotel owners have not sought views, despite that being the recommendation from Council. They clearly don't care about what residents think.

e. There should be a meeting on site to discuss the plans with concerned community members. It would assist to erect scaffolding to show the envelope of the building to appreciate the scale of what is proposed.

Finally, most people in the Freshwater community will have wondered at one time or another how the oversized White Waves came to be built. It, too, was initially pitched as a hotel. Poor and corrupt decision making which prioritised profit for a few individuals over the interests of the community and retaining the character of this special area meant that current and future generations have an eyesore on the beachfront.

If this project goes ahead it will be another White Waves. It will chip away at and destroy what makes Freshie special.

There was overwhelming opposition to the additions currently being undertaken at the Habord Hotel. Despite this, these developments proceeded because Council did not follow through on opposing the development through all the legal channels. We implore Council to show greater conviction with this proposal in doing the right thing by our local community.

Kind regards,
David and Anna Supierz