
Sent: 18/02/2021 7:42:40 PM
Subject: Online Submission

18/02/2021

MR Paul Grzanka
11 Seaview ST
BALGOWLAH NSW 2093
paulgrzanka@hotmail.com

RE: DA2020/1758 - 11 Lewis Street BALGOWLAH HEIGHTS NSW 2093

Dear Sir,

As a resident of Balgowlah with two children at Balgowlah Heights Public School, which is directly adjacent to the proposed site, I would like to object to the above DA.

My objection is based on the following points:

1. Over-development of the site - It seems to me that the building is not in any way in keeping with the surrounding streetscape or other residential houses. It is a huge over-development of a residential site. Yes, it may be next to a Primary school, but the school buildings are all one-storey whereas the proposed building is two-storey and goes back a long way on the block. It will be an imposing presence on the street and will cause major disruption to the children at the school and neighbours.

Having read the other submissions I also see that the Council Urban Design Department does not support the building plans due to the incorrect setback. If the Developer were to amend his plans to ensure compliance with these setbacks, I cannot imagine that he will be able to comply with the required space ratios which are already only just within the correct parameters as specified in the Statement of Environmental Effects:

- o Indoor space (unencumbered) of 3.25m² per child requiring 185.25m² for the proposed 57 children. The proposed centre has 187.84m² of indoor space; - Outdoor space of 7m² per child requiring 399m² for the proposed 57 children. The proposed centre has 401m² of outdoor space.

2. Non-compliant car park and related traffic hazards - I also don't see how the car park can be approved given that it is already non-compliant due to the size and spacing of the car stackers which are not in line with minimum Australian standards, as indicated in the Traffic Management Report:

- o The detailed headroom clearance for the visitor spaces underneath the relevant car stacker are less than 2.2m. Additionally the available widths for most of the designated staff car stackers detailed on the plans are less than the minimum required 2.4m. The length of the Proposed Child Care Centre car stackers appears to be less than the minimum required 5.4m such that the subsequent positioning of vehicles on and/or in the stackers is unclear. These details will be required to be modified to provide compliant dimensions. It has been advised that the car stackers illustrated within the assessed plans were only indicative and may not accurately reflect the finished product to be used in the proposed development.

Surely, if the car park space dimensions will need to be increased at construction to ensure compliance, this will necessarily have a knock-on effect by requiring an increase in the size of the overall building - which we have established is already non-compliant and should be even

narrower. The report also states there are 6 parent spaces including one disabled spot. This means there are only really 5 spaces as the disabled spot cannot be used by an able-bodied person.

If the car park is effectively unusable then parents will certainly park on the street. Lewis street at this end is already much too busy due to teachers parking there and it is extremely congested at school drop-off and pick-up times. This is already a hazardous environment for children and the addition of even a few cars will create an unacceptable level of risk. I do not believe that Council should approve something as fundamental as parking if it is in any way not compliant. As you have seen from the number of objections relating to traffic dangers, this is a serious concern for a large portion of the community and the Council should not ignore these concerns.

3. Inadequate staff numbers - If the number of car park spaces are reduced due to space constraints, this will have a direct knock-on effect on staff ratios. I already believe these to be understated as the provision of just two 'floating' admin staff to manage all extra activities other than childcare seems wholly insufficient. I know of a local childcare centre with 33 children where, on top of the minimum required ratio of Educators, there is:

- o one full-time off-the-floor Managing Director
- o one full-time Administrator
- o one full-time Chef to prepare the food (which is not made on the premises)
- o two additional 'floating' educators to provide quality care

That would add three extra people at the proposed centre here, bringing the full staff complement at any one time to 14, not 11. If this Application is approved based on existing proposed staff numbers my concern is that the centre will simply increase the staff once it is built and they will park on the street with impunity, increasing the traffic hazard.

4. Over-supply of childcare in this area - Based on data from the Care for Kids website (www.careforkids.com.au), there are ample vacancies in existing childcare centres in the Balgowlah Heights area and neighbouring suburbs. A web search taken on 17 February 2021 created using a search filter for childcare and preschool/kindergartens showed vacancies in 7 out of 7 services available in the vicinity. This would suggest that another childcare centre is not needed and is not in the interests of the community, which, after all, should be the Council's overriding motive for approval. This is a commercial venture and huge overdevelopment in a quiet residential area designed only to benefit the Developer and the individuals selling their site, with no community benefit or support.

I hope that the Council will act in the interests of the local neighbourhood and reflect the majority view of its constituents by rejecting this DA.

Your sincerely,

Paul Grzanka