
Sent: 12/05/2020 3:14:55 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Development at Cabbage Tree Rd BAYVIEW
Attachments: 39 Cabbage Tree Road Proposed Rehabilitation Gym Refusal Summary.docx;

Hi Livia

Once again, thank you for your guidance.

Attached is the submission on behalf of the neighbours for tomorrow's DDP Meeting.

Apologies if it is a bit long... unfortunately, there is much ground to cover.

Best regards

Andrew Tiede

On Tue, May 12, 2020 at 8:23 AM Livia Kekwick
<Livia.Kekwick@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au> wrote:

Hi Andrew,

Thank you for your email.

I have added you to the speakers list for tomorrow's meeting.

Please have your mobile ready at around 10-10.30am.

Please see attached DDP Guidelines for your information. (some points may not apply)

Thanks,

Livia Kekwick

Senior Administration Officer

Business Systems & Administration

t 02 9942 2739

livia.kekwick@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au



From: Andrew Tiede <atiede8@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 11 May 2020 4:12 PM
To: Livia Kekwick <Livia.Kekwick@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Re: Proposed Development at Cabbage Tree Rd BAYVIEW

Hi Livia

Many thanks for your kind and professional assistance.

Sorry for the delay in responding. I've been flat out on other issues.

My mobile phone number is 0429 99 4525

If necessary, my landline back-up is 9999 4525

I will forward you a document listing errors, inconsistencies and objections by the closing date of 4.00 pm, tomorrow.

Best regards

Andrew Tiede

On Mon, May 11, 2020 at 10:38 AM Livia Kekwick
<Livia.Kekwick@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au> wrote:

Hi Cynthia,

Thank you for your email.

Development Determination Panel Meetings are always notified a week before the meeting as per the DDP Charter.

Andrew is more than welcome to speak on your behalf on Wednesday.

Andrew – can you please send me your details so I can contact you on Wednesday.

Regards,

Livia Kekwick

Senior Administration Officer

Business Systems & Administration

t 02 9942 2739

livia.kekwick@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au



From: Cynthia Leabres <cynthialeabres14@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 11 May 2020 10:36 AM
To: Livia Kekwick <Livia.Kekwick@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Andrew Tiede <atiede8@gmail.com>
Subject: Proposed Development at Cabbage Tree Rd BAYVIEW

Dear Livia

Re: Determination Panel 13 May, 39 Cabbage tree road Bayview

I am currently in the USA and have just been advised of the Determination Panel meeting set for Wednesday 13 May to consider the proposed development opposite my home at 39 Cabbage Tree Road Bayview.

I wish to object to such short notice for a determination that will have a very significant negative impact on my property in Bayview. This short notice seems so unfair in the circumstances of the coronavirus restrictions as my neighbours are having a difficult time preparing their detailed objections.

As I am unable to prepare for this critical meeting myself, which I understand will be via a telephone call, I request that my speaking time be allocated to my neighbour, Andrew Tiede, who I have asked to speak and present my case on my behalf.

Yours faithfully

Cynthia Leabres Ryken

Sent from my iPhone

Northern Beaches Council

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL. This email and any materials contained or attached to it ("Contents") may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient contact the sender immediately, delete the communication from your system and destroy any copies. The contents may also be subject to copyright. Any unauthorised copying, disclosure or distribution of the contents is strictly prohibited. Any views expressed in the contents are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Northern Beaches Council. Northern Beaches Council makes no implied or express warranty that the integrity of this communication has been maintained. The contents may contain errors, computer viruses or have been subject to interference in transmission. Northern Beaches Council. [Northern Beaches Council](#)

Northern Beaches Council

PLEASE CONSIDER THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE PRINTING THIS EMAIL. This email and any materials contained or attached to it ("Contents") may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient contact the sender immediately, delete the communication from your system and destroy any copies. The contents may also be subject to copyright. Any unauthorised copying, disclosure or distribution of the contents is strictly prohibited. Any views expressed in the contents are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Northern Beaches Council. Northern Beaches Council makes no implied or express warranty that the integrity of this communication has been maintained. The contents may contain errors, computer viruses or have been subject to interference in transmission. Northern Beaches Council. [Northern Beaches Council](#)

Andrew Norman Tiede
50A Cabbage Tree Road
Bayview NSW 2104

12 May 2020

The General Manager

Northern Beaches Council

Attention: Development Determination Panel

Wednesday 13 May 2020

Re: 39 Cabbage Tree Road, proposed Rehabilitation Gym

Dear Sir/madam

On behalf of the immediate neighbours to the proposed development, I submit the following for your consideration.

Due to the constrained times of Covid-19, everything seems to take longer. I apologise for not having the time to be brief...

In the neighbours view, this proposal does not meet planning controls and has no demonstrable social merit. These points are discussed, cross-referenced and supported by evidence.

1. Does not meet DCP21 planning requirements.

From the Assessment Report (sic):

"The proposed development is located 5m from the front boundary and is therefore inconsistent with the 6.5m minimum setback prescribed by this development control. Whilst the non-compliance is carried across all three levels of the proposed development, the ground level that accomodates for carparking is largely open. The variation is largely seen as response to existing constraints such as the triangular lot configuration and to accomodate acceptable setbacks to the western and south-eastern boundaries in order to prevent impacts to mature native trees along these boundaries."

This is a small 980m2 irregular block that forms a critical part of a high priority wildlife corridor, is An endangered ecological colony and is part of the Cahill Creek floodway. Of course, the site has constraints and that is why it must not be built upon. There is no basis for permission of the 20% variation in the required setback.

Further from the Assessment Report:

"As discussed earlier in this report, the retention of the majority of established trees that line the front boundary of the site as well as the provision of 19 replacement tree plantings is seen to reduce

the overall dominance, built form and visual streetscape impacts of the proposed development on residential properties adjacent to the site.”

All the mature trees should be preserved as should the entire block. Putting a building within a critical narrow wildlife corridor connecting the escarpment to Winnererremy Bay disrupts its connectivity and destroys its purpose.

From the Assessment Report:

The proposal facilitates vehicle manoeuvring in a forward direction to and from the site as well as improving pedestrian amenity through the provision of footpaths.

The proposal plans show a garbage truck manoeuvring area of approx. 10 metres X 2.5 metres located on Council property not on the lot itself. The private contractor will have to drive over the footpath to access the bin.

The provision of footpaths across the length of 39 Cabbage Tree Road will not improve pedestrian amenity. It will encourage a much more dangerous crossing of Cabbage Tree Road only meters away from a past triple fatality car accident!

The footpath will be a dead end, a path to nowhere. If used, it will encourage people to cross busy Cabbage Tree Road near the junction of Annum Road. Very few will backtrack the approx. 70 metres to the safety of the refuge crossing. The current path terminates appropriately at a pedestrian refuge crossing and continues on the other side. This is as it should be. Further, how is a garbage truck driving over and stopping on a pedestrian footpath an improvement to pedestrian amenity?

From the Assessment Report:

The articulated built form of the development and significant use of timber finishes are considered to respond sensitively to the characteristics of the surrounding environment.

A three (3) story building, complete with an illegal five (5) meter frontage, many cubic meters of in-your-face bare confronting concrete and visible parked vehicles from a natural environment cannot be seen as a sensitive response to a tranquil green environment.

The concrete garbage collection area of over 25 square meters, right in front middle of the lot will be an absolute eyesore to everyone. In particular to the neighbours who will look down on this unshielded concrete from their high set houses. How is such an industrial sized expanse of concrete supposed to fit sensitively into the existing surrounding natural lush green environment?

To the neighbours of this proposed development it appears that the entire aspect of parking, driveway access and garbage pick-up areas have not had any consideration in the Assessment Report.

From the Assessment Report:

As previously mentioned within this report, consideration has been given that the use of the site as a rehabilitation gym is not seen to be inconsistent with desired future character of the locality or bring unreasonable amenity impacts to surrounding properties.

The neighbours who live there believe the opposite.

The proposed lot is effectively within a golf course. The only building on the golf course side of Cabbage Tree Road is a single-story green golf course maintenance shed. Plans have been submitted for moving part of this shed to another location. Much of the present maintenance area will be restored to natural greenery – specifically to enhance the high priority wildlife corridor that this proposal will severely impact.

Having an out-of-character three story building with parking for 10 cars, visible from the street is an absolute detrimental impact on surrounding properties. As is the monstrous concrete access for garbage collection located right in front of the proposed development. This is the first thing the neighbours will see looking down from their houses. Not a green jungle but a concrete jungle.

From the Assessment Report:

Based on the above, the proposal in this particular instance, is considered to satisfy the outcomes of this clause and is supported on its merit

There is no demonstrated merit that withstands scrutiny. Merit has to be clearly articulated and demonstrated. Otherwise, it sets a dangerous precedent for the future. For example, my lot is permissible for the construction of a granny flat. With this apparent precedent set just across the road, I guess I can expect a 20% reduction in frontage requirements and have no worries about meeting parking requirements. Right?

Speaking of future, I noticed this by-line under Planning and Development on the Council website:

“Planning for the future to protect our quality of life for future ...”

This proposal does nothing to protect our quality of life for the future... it will destroy the quality of life the neighbours and community currently enjoy and will destroy it for the future with no tangible community benefit as compensation.

Plainly, this proposal does not satisfy the outcome of the clause as intended and is a basis for refusal.

2. Character when viewed from a public place

From the Assessment Report (sic):

Character as viewed from a public place The proposal is seen to be non-compliant with the control that requires parking areas to be located behind the front building line, preferably set back further than the primary building. These parking areas are also to be no greater in width than 50% of the lot frontage, or 7.5 metres, whichever is the lesser. As detailed on the submitted plans, the majority of the vehicle parking is located below the structure of the development, with one (1) parking space is indicated in front of the building. Whilst it is noted that these parking spaces are partially located within the front building line, consideration has been given that the area will generally be open throughout which assists to minimise the overall bulk and scale of the building. Furthermore, the retention majority of the mature Casuarina trees that run along the front boundary will contribute towards screening the parking area so that it appears as being secondary to landscaping. Based on the above, the proposed location of the parking area is considered acceptable on merit, consistent with the outcomes of the clause and not a detrimental outcome that would warrant the refusal of the subject application

Again, a clear non-compliance with the planning control brushed away with an undefined consideration of merit. What merit exactly was that?

The car parking is below ground level. The lot is subject to regular flooding in heavy or persistent rain. It is a floodway and turbulent water sweeps across the lot. In a major flood, water levels are projected to reach around one meter above ground level. Bollards have to be in place to prevent cars washing away to a minimum height of 2.45 meters AHD! Where exactly is the merit in this parking arrangement?

In the Plan of Management, Turnbull Planning make it clear that a key target market is the over 55's.

Where is the public benefit in having a regularly flooded car park to be used by seniors?

Our community response to the Covid-19 pandemic has taught us a lot about precautions. Shouldn't the Northern Beaches Council be applying the precautionary principle in very hazardous situations rather than apparently sweeping obvious serious problems away by claiming undefined merit?

The proposal does not meet this planning control and this is a basis of refusal.

3. Proposal does not meet car parking requirements.

From the Assessment Report Conditions (sic):

76. Maximum Number of Patrons/Staff The maximum number of patrons/staff within building must not exceed 50 at any one time.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not cause adverse impacts to the traffic network and park

From the McLaren Traffic Engineering and Safety Consultants Report (sic):

1. INTRODUCTION

McLaren Traffic Engineering (MTE) was commissioned by Turnbull Planning International to provide a Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment of the proposed Rehabilitation Gymnasium at 39 Cabbage Tree Road, Bayview.

1.1 Description and Scale of Development The proposed indoor recreation facility, as depicted in Annexure A, has the following scale relevant to this traffic and parking impact assessment:

- Rehabilitation Gymnasium with a total of 371m² Gross Floor Area (GFA);*
- Maximum patronage of up to 30 patrons;*
- Operational hours of 8:00am to 6:30pm from Monday to Saturday (inclusive);*
- Ten (10) car parking spaces, including one disabled;*
- Vehicular access to the car park is provided via a proposed two-way driveway from Cabbage Tree Road, with entry and exit from the northern boundary of the site*

The McLaren Report clearly states that the maximum patronage will be up to 30 patrons. Yet, the Assessment Report Approval Condition 76 clearly states the maximum number of patrons/staff within the building must not exceed 50 people at any one time.

There are several issues here.

Firstly, McLaren did their calculation on 30 patrons yet permission is for up to 50 people on site. So, exactly how will 10 parking places cater for 50 people?

Secondly, the Condition 76 says "within the building". So, how many additional people can be outside on site, e.g. in the car park? Where is this specified? What impact will this have on neighbourhood amenity?

Thirdly, the proposed parking allotment does not meet RMS parking requirements and McLaren explained away the shortfall due to the use of a Toyota Hilux (or similar) minibus to ferry clientele. I can find no reference to this minibus and its operations in the Assessment Report despite the neighbours lodging a clear objection to its unlikely operational effectiveness. Yet, as can be seen from the following, the mini bus is critical to the permissibility of parking arrangements.

From the McLaren Traffic Engineering and Safety Consultants Report (sic):

3.2 RMS Parking Requirement For a comparative assessment of the Council's DCP car parking requirement, reference is made to Road and Maritime Services' (RMS) "Guide to Traffic Generating Developments (Guide)-section 5.9.2" which provide the following parking rates for gymnasiums. Gymnasiums Metropolitan sub-regional areas: Minimum provision 4.5 spaces per 100m² Desirable provision 7.5 spaces per 100m² The resulting RMS parking requirements for the subject gymnasium are summarised in Table 2.

Rehabilitation Gymnasium Page 5 of 1539 Cabbage Tree Road, Bayview 190225.01FA-9th October 2019

TABLE 2: RMS PARKING REQUIREMENTS Land Use Category Scale Rate Spaces Required (1) Spaces Provided Gymnasium Minimum 371m 24.5 per 100m 216.7 (17) 10 Desirable 7.5 per 100m 227.8 (28) Total --- 17(2) or 28(3) 10

NOTES: (1) As the DCP does not specify rounding requirements, rounding to the nearest integer has been undertaken;

(2) Required spaces for the minimum RMS gymnasium rate; (3) Required spaces for the desirable RMS gymnasium rate. As shown in Table 2, the development requires a minimum of 17 spaces, or a desirable requirement of 28 car parking spaces in accordance with the RMS rates. The proposed development provides a total of ten (10) spaces, representing a shortfall of 7 spaces from the minimum RMS requirement, or 18 from the desirable rate.

The proposal for 10 car spaces represents a shortfall of a minimum 7 car spaces and a shortfall of a desirable 18 car spaces.

Clearly, the whole car parking arrangement at this site is unsatisfactory in every respect and this is a basis for refusal.

From the McLaren Traffic Engineering and Safety Consultants Report (sic):

Justification for this parking shortfall from the RMS rates is provided in Section 3.2.1 .Justification for Parking Shortfall from RMS requirements

3.2.1.1 Use of Private Shuttle Bus It is understood that the gymnasium will provide a private shuttle bus for the collection and transport of customers from nearby retirement villages or private homes by prior arrangement. The vehicle used will consist of a "vandy people mover" vehicle able to transport up to 10 people such as a Toyota Hiace (B99 vehicle). The use of a shuttle bus will reduce the parking demand of the proposed gymnasium from that of a typical gymnasium's operation. The extent of this reduction is dependent on the operation of the private shuttle bus which, it is understood, will vary subject to demand in accordance with the Plan of Management (PoM) for the subject proposal.

In their report, McLaren state "The extent of this reduction is dependent on the operation of the private shuttle bus which, it is understood, will vary subject to demand in accordance with the Plan of Management (PoM) for the subject proposal."

This is waffle. This shuttle bus operation must replace the shortfall of a minimum 7 car spaces for this proposal to be legal. I cannot find any detailed plan or schedule of operations to prove that it can do so. I could not even find a condition of Approval that required the use of such a bus.

We submit the shuttle bus will struggle and will not be viable. This has been demonstrated in detail in my written objection, which has been totally ignored in the Assessment Report.

McLaren vaguely (*"it is understood"*) refer to the Plan of Management, which is even less convincing. Before this proposal can be seriously even considered for approval, detailed information as to the operations of the minibus must be provided and verified. Otherwise, the car parking arrangement has a shortfall of 7 parking spaces. This is unacceptable and is a basis for refusal.

From the McLaren Traffic Engineering and Safety Consultants Report (sic):

3.2.1.2 On-Street Carparking

Based on a visit to the subject site, it was noted that there was a large availability of on-street kerbside parking available within Annam Road within close proximity of the subject site. To provide for safe access to the kerbside parking in Annam Road, a pedestrian path is provided from the site to within the road verge of Cabbage Tree Road. In accordance with Council's Pre DA comments and the Draft Pittwater Bike Plan 2016, it is understood that consideration has been given toward a future active transport corridor that is proposed to run adjacent to the site along Cabbage Tree Road, including an expected 2.5m shared path along the frontage of the site. Though the Plan remains in draft form, the plans provided in Annexure A indicate how the site and the proposed driveway could accommodate a possible shared path within the road verge in the future at Council's discretion. It is presumed that a shared path along the frontage of the site would connect to the proposed internal pedestrian path and the existing

Rehabilitation Gymnasium Page 6 of 1539 Cabbage Tree Road, Bayview 190225.01FA-9th October 2019 pedestrian refuge located to the west of the site. As the provision of a 2.5m shared path by Council is expected, it is considered that this path will provide suitable pedestrian access to the existing pedestrian refuge, and consequently Annam Road. As such, it is considered that in the unlikely event that the site demands more than 10 car parking spaces, any overflow parking demand can be suitably accommodated within the available on-street parking available within Annam Road with pedestrian connection via a 2.5m wide shared path.

Pedestrians would have to walk over 150 metres from even a close parking spot on Annam Road if they were to use the pedestrian refuge. Otherwise they will have to cross Cabbage Tree Road near Annam Road without a good view to the left of on-coming traffic. Given that the target market is seniors, this is not safe.

From the McLaren Traffic Engineering and Safety Consultants Report (sic):

As such, it is considered that in the unlikely event that the site demands more than 10 car parking spaces, any overflow parking demand can be suitably accommodated within the available on-street parking available within Annam Road with pedestrian connection via a 2.5m wide shared path.

What modelling has McLaren is to justify its statement "in the unlikely event that the site demands more than 10 car parking spaces"?

Especially as the RMS minimum requirement is 17 and a desired number is 28. Unless, like the rest of us who live in the area, they realise that this whole proposal is unviable.

McLaren also state "it was noted that there was a large availability of on-street kerbside parking available within Annam Road within close proximity of the subject site."

There is always high inherent risk on basing an opinion on one visit. This is not at all the experience of the people who live here every day. Very frequently, Annum Road is parked out on both sides of the road, bus stop included, well past Kiah Close.

Further, our friends and neighbours in Annum Road will be furious when they learn that their limited parking spaces are to be used as overflow parking for this unwanted proposed development.

How does this benefit the community?

4. Rehabilitation Gyms in the Bayview - Mona Vale area and Social Merit

The neighbours to the proposed rehab gym do not believe the proposal has any social merit whatsoever. From the Assessment Report we glean that the major purported social benefit is locating a gym in the Bayview area, as none exist in this suburb. The following discussion and documentation substantiate our view.

In my letter of objection of November 2019, I wrote:

"Applicant is wrong in asserting that there are no similar facilities available in close proximity. There are no less than 7 existing rehab gyms with a Mona Vale address."

In the Applicant Response to Objections, Turnbull Planning responded in December 2019: (sic)

Please see Annexure 1 to this letter. The assertion made by the objector is factually incorrect and entirely devoid of fact-based evidence. Once again, these are merely weasel words and are a form of tergiversation, used to mislead or disguise a highly biased view. The fact is that the objector is wrong, and Annexure 1 shows that to be the case. The promulgation by the objector of incorrect facts derogates from the substance of many, if not all, of the assertions made in the objection. The objection provides evidence of self-interest and bias in this regard

OK, so here is the fact-based evidence.

It is sourced from a simple Google search for 'gyms in Mona Vale area' conducted on Sunday 10 May 2020 with distances from 39 Cabbage Tree Road by Google Maps:

#	Facility Name	Address - Mona Vale (or noted)	Walking Km	Driving Km
1	Rebound Health	90 Mona Vale Rd	1.5	1.5
2	Core Fitness	1C Ponderosa Pde Warriewood	1.5	1.5
3	Concept 42	81 Bassett	1.6	1.7
4	Bikini Bods	101 Darley St	1.7	1.6
5	<i>*Place of Chai</i>	<i>28 Emma St</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>1.9</i>
6	Black Label Fitness	5 Ponderosa Pde Warriewood	1.8	1.8
7	Arcadia Private Hospital	4 Daydream St Warriewood	1.8	1.9
8	Active Pilates/Sports	1 Bungan St	1.8	2.2
9	Gracie Gym Jiu-Jitsu	54 Darley St	1.9	1.9
10	The Mona Vale Gym	10 Tongah Cres	1.9	2.0
11	Pilates NY	7 Bungan St	1.9	1.9
12	Anytime Fitness	7 Taronga Place	2.0	2.0
13	Sky Personal Training	19 Bungan St	2.0	2.1

14	Fitness First	10 Park St	2.1	1.9
15	Plus Fitness	1 Waratah St	2.1	2.1
16	Curves	7 Waratah St	2.1	2.6
17	Vision Personal Training	9 Waratah St	2.1	2.6
18	F45 Training	1735 Pittwater Rd	2.3	3.0
19	Fit State of Mind	1727 Pittwater Rd	2.3	3.0
20	KX Pilates	1 Mona Vale Rd	2.3	2.3

Fact: there are at least 17 existing rehab gyms with a Mona Vale address with at least 3 more in Warriewood.

In their Annexure 1, Turnbull Planning chose to draw a 1km radius around the subject site and noted that *Place of Chai* was within a 1 km radius of 39 cabbage Tree Road.

But what is the relevance of a 1km radius? Much of the area within the radius is uninhabited, being golf course, waterways, parks and escarpment.

Surely travelling distance is more appropriate. I don't know anyone who can travel as the crow flies. Am I missing something?

From this table, it is manifest that our area is over supplied with full-service gyms and rehab facilities that have a lot of spare capacity. How do I know that? I phoned and/or visited at least half a dozen gyms and asked about their services and whether they had room for more participants. I consistently heard that there was spare capacity and intense competition in the area.

In addition, the major aged care providers have their own exercise and rehabilitation facilities on site, complete with trained staff and heated pools. I reported on this in my letter of objection as I phoned a representative sample of aged care providers in November 2019 to better understand the situation.

Based on these facts, and my representative research, I can confidently say that there is no public interest served by yet another rehab gym in the area.

If there was a commercial demand for a gym actually located in Bayview, there are possible locations in commercial premises along Pittwater Road that would have been exploited long ago. In addition, group gym classes, like the Zumba referred to in the Applicant's Plan of Management, can be comfortably and very economically conducted by hiring the halls at BYRA or the Sea Scouts. Both are well-located with plenty of parking, bus stops at the door and with adequate group exercise facilities. I wonder why classes are not regularly conducted there?

Yet much has been made of this 1km radius and the fact that there are no gyms in Bayview in the Assessment Report. In fact, it appears to be the key public benefit of this entire proposal. I wonder if the Assessment Officer took the trouble to do a little independent research or was the Assessment Report solely based on the Applicant's information and their Annexure 1? Certainly, the Assessment report does not address many of the specific issues raised in our submissions last year...

In my letter of objection, I also wrote:

"Not a viable location for such a small gym and rehabilitation area"

In the Applicant Response to Objections, Turnbull Planning responded:

The site is conveniently positioned at the convergence of major road routes [see above, as well as the SEE], is well-located with regard to its proximity to bus services, and is within a relatively short walking distance from a range of amenities, services and facilities located within the Mona Vale retail and commercial precinct. The site is close to residential areas where demand for such a facility is likely to occur. To the north-east of the site, on the opposite side of Cabbage Tree Road, is Aveo Bayview Gardens, which provides assisted living apartments and independent living units for seniors. There are other such facilities in Cabbage Tree Road. The site is also located within a relatively short walking distance of a variety of public open space areas.

This response totally makes the case against the need for a gym in this location.

- The site location at the convergence of major road routes obviously indicates that the Applicants expect potential clientele to arrive by car. Yet there are only 10 parking spaces - the assessment approves up to 50 people in the building at any one time. And how many more outside?
- All major road routes pass closer gyms along the way that are already well-established. Why wouldn't they stop there first?
- (The site) is within a relatively short walking distance from a range of amenities, services and facilities located within the Mona Vale retail and commercial precinct. Precisely – that is why and where most of the gyms are located! Because many people who go to the gym like to socialise, have a coffee, etc as part of their gym experience. This is why such a small out-of-the-way site cannot compete with the facilities offered by well-differentiated alternatives in Mona Vale.
- The bus services in the area all go to Mona Vale. Only bus route 155 is less than a 400 metre plus walk from the 39 Cabbage Tree Road site. So, why would anyone use this site?
- The Aveo Group have advised me that they have their own facilities at their 3 Bayview locations including heated swimming pools and Zumba Gold group classes. They told me there wouldn't be any interest from an outside gym for their residents!
- There is no requirement to visit a gym at 39 Cabbage Tree Road or anywhere else to enjoy our public open spaces.

In summary, I submit of behalf of the neighbours that locating a restricted-facility gym constrained by the small lot size and flooding terrain is not in the public interest and has no social merit.

5. Objection to proposal summary

The proposed development does not meet DCP21 requirements with respect to:

- Front boundary
- Parking
- Character when viewed from a public place

The neighbours to the site submit that the proposed development has no demonstrable merit or social value and are confident that this has been definitively demonstrated.

The proposal is clearly not in the public interest and that is underscored by the no less than 78 Conditions already imposed on this proposed development. This does not include outstanding issues that do not appear to have been addressed in the Assessment Report.

Aspects of this proposal are demonstrably downright dangerous and hazardous and are likely to be an unnecessary burden on the entire community in the future.

The motto of Northern Beaches Planning is "Planning for the future to protect our quality of life for future ..."

This proposed development will do nothing to protect our quality of life for the future. It will tarnish and destroy it.

On behalf of the neighbours, I submit that this proposal must be refused.

Yours faithfully

Andrew Tiede

M: 0429 99 4525