

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 13/12/2022 10:55:19 AM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

13/12/2022

MR Darren Bramwell  
48 Corrie road RD  
North manly NSW 2100  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2022/1985 - 27 Waine Street FRESHWATER NSW 2096**

I am the son in law of the owners of unit 14/ 29-33 Waine street and have reviewed this application and make the following additional comments on their behalf:

25 Waine street

**Parking**

Moving the driveway from the north of the property to the south along with making this a really dangerous location for a driveway means that 2 street parking spaces are removed with none returning because of yellow lines. This means the number of available spaces is actually less than the required number for the amount of units.

**Car spaces provided**

1.5 spaces for a 3 bedroom apartment although as per the council guidelines is actually crazy when multiplying the number of units and not rounding first. The total provided should be 2 per unit meaning 12 spaces should be provided, plus an accessible space plus a visitor space meaning the proposal should be 14 cars not 7 on grade spaces .

**Stacked car spaces**

The 5 proposed stacked spaces is not even 1 per unit meaning that a unit will only be provided with stacked car spaces.

The traffic assessment does not show how these spaces will be utilised meaning once a car is lifted forward and titled it will not have sufficient space to turn in or out of the space making these not in accordance with the Australian Standards to access theses spaces.

**Landscapping**

Landscaping guidelines of 50% area is not even close to being addressed with the basement taking at least 95% of the land lending to podium slabs for planting only and tree growth will therefore be reduced. The proposal shows a calculation of 26% of area available for landscaping, I would question how this 26% calculation is made up and note this is barely half of the required 50% and the 26% includes podium landscaping which is not deep soil planting and will restrict the growth of any trees planted in this zone.

height

The planning requirements as shown in the submission and the reasons for not meeting them are not valid and the blocks seems way over developed as per councils own planning rules which have not been met.

The increased height by the proposal uses the example of the adjacent property being higher than it is proposed to be. I'm not sure how this is relevant given that it's base is lower as the hill goes up. If proposed property was at the bottom of the hill would they propose an even higher building?

#### Number of storeys

The proposal is for a 5 storey building as detailed in the submitted BCA report. This does not address the 3 storey limit in councils approved planning guidelines. The proposal is 4 storeys only on the north side but 5 storeys on the south side as detailed in the BCA report.

#### Setbacks

The proposal has reduced setbacks to all boundaries. This adds to the safety and traffic concerns as visibility on a corner block will be reduced as the site has been overdeveloped. The proposal should keep within the approved planning rules to all boundaries as sufficient screening has not been provided and any additional screening with cut the visibility for the road.

#### Conclusion

The proposal should meet all planning laws as per the approved LEP and DCP for the site and in its current form it should not be approved as it will lead to increased safety concerns not being met as detailed above.