

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 23/05/2023 12:41:47 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

23/05/2023

MS Kirsty Drummond  
219 Pittwater Road RD  
Manly NSW 2095  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2023/0386 - 207 - 217 Pittwater Road MANLY NSW 2095**

My husband and I own and occupy 219 Pittwater Rd, Manly. We have called this home for 16 years. We consider ourselves to be an accommodating family and understand the changes to the area as homes have expanded and new services have been established to meet the need for families in the area (e.g. the new childcare, and girls high school expansion etc). We also understand our neighbours desire to renovate and alter their property. However we are unwilling to support the proposed development that our neighbor 207-217 Pittwater Rd has submitted.

Our opposition to this is as follows:

**1. FENCE/BOUNDARY**

We literally neighbour 207-217 and share a boundary fence. Currently our boundary fence is a tasteful wooden paling fence that is in keeping with the area and surrounds - that is majority residential. The current fence is about 1.8m high from the front rising to 2.5m at the back. This is in keeping with what was installed historically. We are opposed to the plans to have a masonry fence - most likely it would be a besser block that will probably be rendered on the car wash side and unrendered on our side. Boundary fences are a matter for parties to reach an amicable consensus on. This proposed wall will be austere, unsightly to the aesthetics of our home which has heritage features and given the proposed height of 3m it will undoubtedly block all natural light to our dining room, kitchen and backyard. We do not welcome or support the proposed unsightly wall.

Based on the Northern Beaches Council requirements, the recommended fence height is 1.8m in a residential zone (the maximum for a masonry fence is 1.2m). The proposed wall is not acceptable. Fence and boundary heights should remain at the existing heights.

This is inconsistent with the developments of two other service stations on Pittwater Road all within 700 metres of each other.

There is a BP service station on Pittwater Road about 350 metres away, the boundary fences there do not exceed 1.8m.

Another 350 metres up Pittwater Road is yet another service station. The Ampol service station has 1.8m boundary fences with its neighbours.

Further the proposal to have this 3m boundary wall support the enclosed roof is a huge concern. How can approval be granted for an enclosed structure to be constructed right on the boundary line with no set back? It's a form of encroachment and will essentially bear down on

our home. This again is major deflection from the current roofline. The proposed enclosed roof structure will block all natural light to the rear of our property and to those homes on Golf Parade. We have further concerns with the adequacy of storm water runoff, drainage pipes etc. The delicate line of managing the needs of a commercial owner to turn a profit along with us as home owners to try and retain some homeliness to our home and investment is very much at odds with this proposal. This is a residential area with the petrol station being a commercial property - these plans essentially seek to 'industrialize' this area - it is a residential zone. All residential neighbors which share a boundary are equally distressed and upset with this proposal, undoubtedly this will create a destructive impact to our lives and our homes. As owner residents we are rate payers too - the negative impact this proposal will have not only destroys the enjoyment, functionality and use of our homes, but also our lifestyle and our property prices. The proposed plans seem to benefit only one party and that is the petrol station owner.

## 2. NOISE/HOURS OF OPERATION

The hours of operation and the likelihood of increased noise is a huge concern. The neighborhood is impacted and disrupted by the noisy petrol tankers refueling in the morning, the garbage collection, delivery trucks not to mention the inconsiderate patrons of the service station who elect to wash and vacuum their cars outside of the recommended opening/closing hours. I have lost count of the times when selfish patrons feel the need to blast their music as they clean their cars - often outside the hours of operation. There clearly is a motivation to attract increased traffic and patronage to the site and this can only result in greater disruption, disturbance and noise. I can vouch for the uptick and general chaos from traffic congestion when petrol prices were making the daily news, there is insufficient space to support queuing at a cross intersection. The congestion from a few months back was the busiest I have ever seen the petrol station. With the high volume of foot traffic going to/from Harris Farm, families and kids going to Little Lane Daycare and the students going to the nearby high school campuses, these factors combined with the reality of impatient drivers when faced with increased congestion only invites further chaos to the area and the greater potential for accidents.. The owners are not developing the site if they didn't expect an uptick in patronage. The downside effects have been overlooked.

We have grave concerns for the noise this mechanical car wash will have and the effectiveness of any noise reducing materials. The noise coming from the existing car wash and vacuums is already excessive - how can adding in another car wash lessen noise? A mere 270 meters on Pittwater Road there is a Star Car Wash and yet another car wash 2km at the BP, North Manly. Does the Manly community really need yet another car washing facility?

3. SAFETY - This area of Pittwater Road is a busy section of road. It was only after a number of car accidents that a refuge island was installed to better manage the safety of families and young preschoolers going to the Little Lane Daycare, the high school students attending the Stella Maris campus and the increased congestion from cars and pedestrians alike frequenting Harris Farm. Given this was installed in hindsight following a number of accidents it was evident that pedestrian safety had not been a priority. There are multiple entry/exit points to the petrol station with merging traffic, a sharp bend and glare of the low afternoon setting sun - adding a drive through car wash arrangement would not seem to address any safety issues with pedestrians walking past.

4. DAMAGE - We have concerns about the impact the work will have to our property. Following the last major renovation in 2008/2009 and work again in 2010 when new underground pumps were installed, our property suffered cracking in the lounge room and dining room walls. We

took photographs at the time and can demonstrate the before/after effects of that work. Notwithstanding some work will go ahead we wish to note this and invite those builders to inspect our property prior to any work starting and then again at the end of the build. We expect any damages to be rectified.

This section of Manly is the home and neighborhood for many hardworking families. Often our concerns and needs seem to be overlooked (e.g. the refuge island installation and the campaign to reinstate the off street parking that was removed; the recent work to footpaths last week where little/no notice was given, no safe pedestrian measures put in place). To have this type of development go ahead without consideration to the lifestyle and impact to our homes would be unsympathetic and disdainful. This area is majority residential and we recognise we must share it, however changes must be considered compassionately with the needs of others in mind and not simply be decisions blinded by commercial goals.