
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 23/11/2021 10:44:54 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

23/11/2021

MRS Helen Sagan
213 Fullers RD
Chatswood West NSW 2067
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2021/1912 - 2 - 4 Lakeside Crescent NORTH MANLY NSW 2100

21.11.21
Helen Sagan
7 Lakeside Crescent,
North Manly
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2021/1912

I wish to lodge my objection to all of the development applications relating to the old Queenscliff Health Centre site but specifically the following development applications DA 2021 /1914 & DA 2021/1912.

I believe all of these current DA plans lend themselves to future building and social developments not in keeping with the area, leading to detrimental environmental consequences to our local neighbourhood that will immediately and unacceptably impose upon me, my family, my property and my neighbourhood.

I was astonished to read that fundamentally the very same Development Applications, that were rejected by the Council last time, were lodged again, only with a new provider! Not one alternative to the resident's previous objections and submissions were considered, brought forward for acknowledgement or amended. It seems the aim of affordable housing from the State authorities perspective must be to cram as many people as possible into the smallest space conceivable, while selling off all other land for profit!

We, the local residents, do NOT want this scenario to unfold! We/I would like to welcome long term residents to create stable hospitable homes, a friendly neighbourhood and generous greenspaces for all residents (new, young and old) to live in prosperity and enjoy.

I strongly object to the Subdivision, and the non-compliant nature of these 2 specific DA's. Neither DA 2021 /1914 or DA 2021/1912 should be presented (or granted approval) in isolation, as both DA's significantly impact on the outcome of the other.

If the Subdivision is approved it substantially decreases the suitable ways many of the outstanding detrimental issues of DA2021/1912 can be resolved (eg. parking, traffic, waste, greenspace). Both DA's should be processed in conjunction with one another or as one DA. Additionally, either DA may be administered perhaps months/years apart, not providing a holistic overview of the lasting consequences for our neighbourhood, nor does dividing the

existing block into 2 DA's, to carve up the land, suggest the developers have our best interests in focus.

I would like to request Northern Beaches Council consider the big picture, and enforce the incorporation of both DA's so the entire project is treated as one development. This way it ensures the entire project is adequately understood and enacted, not fractured into indiscernible pieces.

I would like to wholeheartedly concur with my neighbour John Worrel by similarly replicating the following passage from his objection letter. "Under the Warringah Local Environment Plan 2011, R2 Low Density Residential means that seniors housing is prohibited within this zone. The current Development Application claims that the State Environmental Planning Policy overrides the LEP. This is not so! In August, Rob Stokes proposed in the Environment Planning and Assessment Act that this loophole be closed so that Seniors Housing will no longer be permitted in R2 zones across the Northern Beaches and that any Seniors Housing development not already approved may not proceed. Our mayor, Michael Regan has already noted his concern about this, saying council will apply to get an exemption from state planning rules 'so we don't have to continue to consider proposals that are not in keeping with the character of our neighbourhoods' and 'No one wants to see our area overdeveloped or the local character destroyed.' "

Well-articulated Mr Worrel and Mayor Regan! Senior housing developments are not in keeping with R2 zones for well defined reasons, they are generally medium to high density developments and not in keeping with R2 neighbourhoods! What a shame that a loophole should be exploited for profit rather than used to enrich the lives of those residents the NSW State are claiming to be helping. Overdeveloping this site and cramming as many people as possible into the smallest space conceivable, while selling off all other land for profit does not enhance the local environment, community or anyone's living standards.

Furthermore, if the proposed subdivision DA 2021 /1914 is approved, the subdivided blocks are earmarked to be sold, either individually or together. Are these blocks to be rezoned also to medium or high density? In fact, as these current subdivision DA's suggest, it is entirely possible one property developer will purchase all subdivided blocks.

The R2 zoning requirements seem to be extremely flexible when it suits the NSW State government, any manner of zoning might be implemented for maximum profit, high density structures certainly could be constructed. Without any clear indication as to what will be developed or how much greenspace there will be, the possibility of compounding and overwhelming our low density neighbourhood is imminent as well as insufferably exacerbating the existing traffic issues and parking problems in the process.

These proposed developments want to install 37+ individual dwellings upon the Health Clinic site. The entire dwelling count for the 3 surrounding streets (Lakeside, Riverview & Park) is only 91! To suddenly introduce 37+ dwellings into a quiet cul-de-sac circuit that contain only 91 dwellings is hugely disproportionate. Adding 37 mixed social housing occupancy dwellings within the confines of our neighbourhood is frightfully disturbing, completely, unbalanced and not good urban planning.

More to, once this development has been constructed, what sort of ongoing management system will be in place, will it be Landcom, Wentworth or... ? Who will ongoingly own/manage and maintain the individual units and grounds? Is 'affordable housing' a fancy name for 'social housing' where residents pay rent to the State for the term of their occupancy and once it expires the unit reverts back to social housing? Or, does 'affordable housing' mean a scheme where, if residents stay long enough and pay enough (like a mortgage), they will eventually

own the unit title outright and can bequeath it in their will? If so, the units will only be 'short term' 'affordable housing' and will eventually become available real estate for the general public to purchase. Will the boarding accommodation still be operating when the other units will be sold on and privately owned?

Have all of the local residents been notified of what will exist 10-20-30 years into the future regarding this development because I'm not sure I fully understand the implications of what I will be living with?

There are lots and lots of questions and many intricate details regarding these developments that must be disclosed to the local residents. If they are already available, I haven't been able to clarify them, as I should not have to wade through mountain loads of documents and waste many days of my precious time to find the answers. There should be full accountability to ensure the public in general is informed, but specifically that the local residents fully understand the outcomes before any development should proceed!

Of the 37 units, 25 are proposed to be self-contained and 12 with shared facilities. Will the senior residents be sharing facilities with boarders? Who is sharing facilities? Once again I'm not terribly sure I understand the integration of this mixed living arrangement, with my limited understanding, I do not agree that this mixed use housing is a healthy dynamic. What category of boarding residents will there be? Will the short term boarding occupants also be from a mixed background (eg: mental health, physical disability, homeless, drug dependant, woman's refuge) and when the ongoing tenure for management of the boarding units expire, will local residents have a say who manages the facility next?

Integrating long term elderly occupants with short term transient occupants, would cause a social disaster and mental wellbeing problems for all concerned, especially in such confined premises. Creating mixed occupancy of this kind will not be conducive to generating a sense of belonging to our neighbourhood community, as stated in Landcom's Project Objectives. I do not believe this plan will integrate seamlessly into the surrounding neighbourhood.

37 homes are proposed in DA2021/1912 but only 6 car spaces have been allowed. This ratio is enormously inconsistent, either there needs to be less occupants or more parking places. I opt for less occupants and to stay with R2 zoning!

The development site, is currently zoned for Low Density housing (R2) and so therefore it should be made transparent that any future building developments on both DA's adhere to the same occupancy ratio to stay in keeping with the area.

It appears the developers would like it both ways; R2 zoning for traffic, parking and infrastructures and any other zone that suits their needs for development purposes.

At present, the planned carparking allowance for the Queenscliff Health Centre site, does not acknowledge that 'every' proposed occupant 'will' own a car and have need to park it, let alone there might be family or friends visiting creating more than one car per unit.

Lakeside Crescent and Palm Avenue car parking spaces are already at a premium, often residents cannot find street parking close to their home due to many businesses on Pittwater Road occupying the area for themselves and their customer parking throughout the day and also commuters arriving early in the morning seeking easy free parking. Even now it can be difficult to find parking on returning home from a shopping trip and frustrating to cart belongings and bags considerable distances, for lack of parking spaces close to home. Add 37+ cars = impossible. Yes, that will immediately and unacceptably impose upon me, my family, my property and my neighbourhood.

On another note, I strongly oppose the DA proposal as it requires 38 mature mostly native trees to be removed! These trees are a sanctuary for our native fauna who cannot exist without the flora that is their habitat. These trees are a segment of an ecosystem, their canopy provides a safe natural corridor allowing native birds and animals a thoroughfare to the lagoon for foraging and back to their nesting grounds away from the foreshore. Removing these trees

drives tree dwelling creatures to traverse at ground level making them frightfully exposed to feral animals and being killed by road traffic. As I understand there are other Development and Subdivision options available that will be less brutal to this delicate local biome and I would like to suggest Council allows more time for further exploration.

I would like to stress that I am not opposed to the former Queenscliff Community Health Centre being developed for long term affordable housing, especially for women over 55, in fact I am very much in support of such a project that will make good use of the beautiful building providing the units are large enough for family and friends to visit.

I would like to welcome our potential new neighbours, not fight them for a car spot! I believe the present development applications, do not offer a suitable fit for our neighbourhood. All options must be investigated that are less invasive for the environment, kinder to the people living around it and more humane to the prospective (disadvantaged) residents living within it. Affordable housing occupants should not be crammed in like sardines, they need a hand up, not a slap down and any future developments should comply to R2 zoning.

In Closing, I trust that Council will reject the current Development Applications relating to the former Queenscliff Health Centre Site, as they rightly did previously, and grant the local community further time for all options to be thoroughly explored and all aspects of the development to be fully disclosed to ascertain a fair and equitable outcome for all interested party's before granting project approval.

Regards,
Helen Sagan