
Sent: 17/09/2021 2:31:21 PM
Subject: Online Submission

17/09/2021

MR BRYAN WEBSTER
- 194 WHALE BEACH RD
Whale Beach NSW 2107
bryanwebster1@bigpond.com

RE: REV2021/0034 - 231 Whale Beach Road WHALE BEACH NSW 2107

TO THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICER,

I am submitting this as an objection to the latest redevelopment plans as noted re 231 Whale Beach Road Whale Beach.

Firstly, re Roads & Assets, the opening comment by the Officer at NBC stating there is insufficient detail to assess, when surely it is his/her responsibility to ensure there is detail. It is noted that work by the owner if being considered, is supported. What work?

Surely the joining of the existing footpath is mandatory as is a footpath from the planned cafe to the beach, again on council land. Is this a fixture of the redevelopment? Safety for pedestrians is a must refer TFE Consulting p5/31 matter 8, footpaths both sides of Surf Road.

Per TFE, parking in Whale Beach/Surf Roads is more limited than therein stated, with timed zones, weekend bans on Whale Beach Rd eastside, Moby Dick staff / guests and local residents utilising most spots nearby.

I challenge the TFE Conclusion p29/31, parking is still 4 short but that's OK as it is better than the previous deficit, and the surrounding streets can cater in a suburb where on-street parking is in high residential demand.

TFE's referral to Public Bus access is as ludicrous as it first was, as Barrenjoey Road is 800 m away up and over a steep hill with no footpaths on a narrow road. Sannikov's conclusion of support is considered a case of getting you what pay for.

TOMASY PLANNING P/L
Planning report
p5/63
Point 15

Where are the dimensions/location of the lift over run? I don't recall I in the first DA and I can't find it in the current one, possibly hidden somewhere?

p6/63
point 36/37

Congratulations for providing a footpath from beach and connecting existing path from Whale Beach road to beach, I am assuming this is mandatory?

point 43

What is neighborhood retail shop? What are the hours and limitations to prevent it becoming a café or similar, or with addition of seating area for the restaurant below? What noise controls are applicable?

Point 45

Car stackers have been found to be underused in other developments which will release parking onto the beach and local streets. How can you let this be considered, we all know the outcome.

p28/63

Notes that takeaway food and drinks permissible, this implies a dine in restaurant is not? Where as it appears in the plans.

p28-34/63

Refers to other buildings/residences in Whale Beach. It implies that just because he believes they are eye sores, it is ok to recommend this development to join them. Somewhat crass!!

Conclusion

The redevelopment is still too BIG. The 5 units/apartments (strata title) currently, 3 x 1 bedroom and 2 x 2 bedroom, with minimal footprint, to an increase of the 5 units is not justified anywhere, being 4 x 3 bedrooms and 1 x 4 bedrooms. My math's show that as currently with only 7 in total to an increase of 16 bedrooms, the scale is too BIG!! I recommend the top 4 bedroom unit be deleted as this solves the height/noise/bulk overreach issues. Realistically this will ease parking/traffic problems also. The top level will also be a significant visual eye sore for the opposite neighbors who currently have a less interrupted visual line, myself included. I thank you for the opportunity to have my concerns raised and look forward to your response to my above questions.

Bryan Webster