
Sent: 26/08/2021 12:36:54 PM
Subject: Online Submission

26/08/2021

MR Wyndham Cramer
257 / 28 - Oaks Avenue ST
Dee Why NSW 2099
wyndhamcramer@yahoo.com

RE: DA2021/1314 - 33 Oaks Avenue DEE WHY NSW 2099

257/28 Oaks Avenue,
Dee Why NSW 2099
26 August 2021

Attn: Phil Lane
Assessing Officer
Northern Beaches Council
copy also sent to council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au.

Dear Phil Lane,

Development Application DA2021/1314 (ourmedical Dee Why)

I wish to make a submission opposing the abovementioned DA.
The DA will adversely impact on all residents in the lighthouse precinct but mainly those residents in 28 Oaks Avenue with balconies fronting Oaks Avenue. There are possibly more than 25 apartments affected.

The adverse effects can be summarised as follows:

1. Harm to health and well-being of residents

Large signage on the existing façade above the proposed medical centre façade and the newly proposed gigantic signage on the cladding encompassing the trolley ramp will be illuminated with led gutter light fittings right throughout the night. The resulting light pollution will cause health problems from sleep deprivation for the residents fronting Oaks Avenue.

2. Harm to amenity

The DA proposes large signage on the existing façade above the proposed medical centre with an oppressive dark blue background. In addition, the soft and pleasant white slat cladding covering the trolley ramp will be painted in dark blue and the business signage inserted on these slats

Lighthouse is a vibrant new mixed-use village type precinct. The proposed signage is more akin with an industrial precinct such as Brookvale.

The signage doesn't fit with the character, feel and function of the area.

The precinct is a much sought-after location to reside, most likely due to its relaxed village ambiance. If this DA is to be approved, it may reduce the desirability of the location due to the

industrial type of signage.

While the medical practice submitting the DA would be a very welcome service in the area, it should be sensitive to the unique character of the vicinity and blend into the environment rather than seek to dominate it.

I have addressed the DA's SEPP 64 compliance to Assessment Criteria in an Appendix below

The DA is substantially non-compliant with the Assessment Criteria and hence should be rejected.

Kindest regards,

Wyndham Cramer

Appendix- DA's SEPP 64 compliance to Assessment Criteria

1. Character of the area

The proposal is incompatible with the character of the area which is a mixed-use precinct. Dee Why Markets is a small shopping centre which nicely complements the amenity of the "Lighthouse" which is a vibrant new mixed-use village precinct. There is no signage like the proposed signage either in the current site or anywhere in the vicinity. The signage proposed is more akin with an industrial precinct such as Brookvale. The numerous shops and offices in Oaks Avenue, Howard Avenue and Pacific Parade have unobtrusive signage unlike that proposed in the DA.

There is not a single signage in the vicinity of a similar size, dark coloured background (dark blue) and led lighting illumination from the top to the bottom. In addition, the soft and pleasant white slat cladding covering the trolley ramp, which at present does not have any signage, will be painted from top to bottom in dark blue and the business signage inserted on these slats

2. Special areas

The existing development and the surrounding buildings and business establishments elsewhere in Oaks Avenue, Howard Avenue and Pacific Parade do not contain signage of the scale and size proposed in this DA. The numerous shops and offices have unobtrusive signage unlike that proposed in the DA. The proposal is visually unappealing and impacts on the village and relaxed ambiance of the area with Oaks Avenue assuming the character of an industrial precinct.

3. Views and vistas

The proposal would compromise the district views of residents fronting Oaks Avenue. The signage is on eye level or in the line of sight to all residents in 28 Oaks Avenue with balconies facing Oaks Avenue. The quality of vistas from the balconies will be affected by the distraction from the signage especially when illuminated during the night-time

4. Streetscape, setting or landscape

Taken together signs 1, 2 and 3 and the bottom part of the cladding of the trolley ramp (which is to be painted in dark blue identifying it with the tenant) forms an advertising hoarding that is in the scale and proportion so large and not seen anywhere in Oaks Avenue and the vicinity. The proposal is out of place and does not blend with the streetscape. There is a hedge in front of the white slats at present. There is no mention that the hedge will be retained in the DA and if this hedge is removed it will amplify the size of the tenant's advertising footprint. Since the setting has a village feel with a majority being small businesses with identifying signage, the DA is inappropriate and does not blend with the streetscape and landscape. The signage will visually define the facility imposing its overpowering identify on the site to the detriment of all other business establishments. The hedge in front of the slats will have to require ongoing vegetation management.

5. Site and building

The site contains mainly small-scale businesses with unobtrusive signage. The proposal imposes itself on the both the site and building. The proposed signage is out of place compared to the other businesses in the site.

6. Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures

By painting the entire cladding of the trolley ramps in dark blue identifying with the business, the advertising footprint extends beyond the pure signage of the business.

7. Illumination

The proposal will introduce lighting that does not exist at present, and the signage will be illuminated during the entire duration of darkness each day since there is no curfew. Constant lighting will cause sleep deprivation to residents in Oaks Avenue. The health effects from sleep deprivation to residents would be severe. The assertion that the DA will cause minimum glare is irrelevant since there is no lighting at present to cause any glare. Any lighting in the proposed location is unacceptable since it will prevent the residents from enjoyment of their homes. The only way residents in 28 Oaks Avenue can gain fresh air is from their balconies and they will be forced to contend with the LED lighting.

There is no illumination on the upper façade of Dee Why Markets at present. The illumination would visually detract and be right in the face of almost all residents in the Lighthouse fronting 28 Oaks Avenue. Due to no curfew the lighting will cause enormous glare throughout the night to all residents in the lighthouse fronting 28 Oaks Avenue. There are more than 25 residents directly affected.

8. Safety

As above.