Sent: Subject: 10/11/2020 2:40:57 PM Online Submission

10/11/2020

MRS Kath Whalan 12 Urara RD Avalon Beach NSW 2107 kathrinewhalan@hotmail.com

RE: DA2019/1260 - 29 North Avalon Road AVALON BEACH NSW 2107

Kathrine Whalan 12 Urara Rd Avalon Beach. NSW 2107 kathrinewhalan@hotmail.com.au

RE: OBJECTION TO DA 2019/1260- 27-29 North Avalon Rd, Avalon Beach. NSW. 2107

Please find my new submission in relation the amended plans for the proposed development by NSW LAND AND ENVIRONMENT COURT.

My main concern is the prerequisite that will be set if this development is to go ahead, with Medium Density Housing being allowed to sit within R2 Development Zone, Low-Density Residential. With zero regard to the local environmental plan and the building land-space ratio's associated with R2. The overall scale, height, bulk and hard service coverage is completely out of character for this beautiful low-density residential street and local area that I call home.

I am concerned about the fact that all council publications emphasise maintaining the tree dominant environment in the area. The Avalon Beach DCP states: "Future development will maintain a building height limit below the tree canopy, and minimise bulk and scale. Existing and new vegetation, including canopy trees, will be integrated with development. The objective is that there will be houses amongst trees, not trees amongst houses".

Yet this development application provides for the removal of some 46 plus trees, SADLY some have already been removed before approval has even been granted!! One of the blocks has not officially been signed over or sold to the new developers as yet, but the developers have taken it upon themselves to already start these works. WHAT A DISGRACE! Resulting in the near-complete obliteration of the entire mid-canopy! Not to mention the wildlife that also lives amongst those trees.

North Avalon Road already has two over 55's developments within 50 metres of each other, if this were to be approved it would mean 3 over 55's housing developments within 200-250 metres of each other, so much for a Low-Density Residential area!

SEPP Clause 26 - Location and access to facilities state that the site should be located within 400 metres of a commercial centre or have access to public transport not more than 400 metres from the site.

The local bus stop is more than 400m from the proposed site and if a resident is returning north

on a bus along Barrenjoey Rd the resident has to make a mercy dash across to the centre island, then dash again to make it safely to the other side.

Trust me I have done it plenty of times, and it is absolutely not safe for the young, elderly, or the disabled.

North Avalon shops have no General Practice providers, no pharmacy or medical facilities and no banking facilities. North Avalon shops currently consist of a coffee shop, a small convenience store, a liquor/bottle shop, and a surf clothing store. The local shops by no means provide key elements of a commercial centre for seniors or the disabled.

There are no pedestrian crossings at the T-intersection of North Avalon Rd and Tasman Rd, this particular route gets extremely busy due to Barrenjoey Highschool buses and student and parents dropping and picking up children, and also local surfers and beachgoers using North Avalon carpark. In the summer months, it gets even busier again as you could well imagine.

The increased traffic alone from these proposed new dwellings will only further add to current congestion.

I would also like to know who is the governing body that will be overseeing how many people will permanently reside in each dwelling? These dwellings are up to 3 bedrooms each, if an over 55's couple purchase a dwelling and have 2-3 children we could be looking at 30-50 people living within what is currently a standard 2 house blocks. Adding extra traffic congestion and noise.

Who will be governing when the new potential home owners decide to sell their dwelling, that they are not selling it to anyone under the age of 55?

I fully support all submissions of objection that have previously been made to council against this proposed monstrosity of a development.