
Sent: 14/10/2018 10:38:34 AM

Subject: DA 2017/1274 - 52 CABBAGE TREE ROAD & 1825 PITTWATER ROAD,
BAYVIEW - AMENDED PLANS

Attachments: Amended DA Objection Bayview Golf Course Development.pdf;

ATTN: DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT - MS LASHTA HAIDARI

Please find attached our submission/objection to the amended plans of the proposed development of Bayview Golf Course.

kind regards,

Diane Matheson

We have reviewed the amended plans and documentation to this development. We refer to our initial submission lodged on the 9th February 2018 and confirm that our objections remain.

We believe that the Applicant has in no way made any effort to preserve the existing wildlife corridor, trees, bushland vegetation, scenic protection and character as seen from both public and private place and the amenity of their neighbours. It's solution is rip it all out and compensate with plantings of 3,000 trees and vegetation scattered throughout the golf course (no detail) and which will take at least some 25-30 years to fruition (no guarantee) in other words not in the lifetime of most of us.

It appears that the Applicant believes removing one level from Buildings E & F to three (3) levels instead of four (4) levels addresses the excessive bulk, height, and scale and character issues! Are they serious? By removing one level from a height previously of 14 metres above existing ground level, they are now saying they are only 8.5 metres high. I think what is happening here is that they are burying the buildings further into the ground (some 4 metres further of excavation), which they are likely to seek to vary later, through a Section 96 application, to raise the level of the structure. The increase of excavation will no doubt further increase the geotechnical hazard on the southern boundary. We are concerned that the remaining screening trees will not survive the construction of the three level underground car park & buildings as they are being built too close to the geotechnical hazard.

We strongly object to the excessive bulk, height, scale and character of this development. From our residence, we directly look at the Buildings E & F perched high on the hill and because Buildings C & D, which are directly behind, it looks to be more like 5 storeys (3 + 2) appearing above the current treetops. These buildings are just a block of flats, which are totally out of character to the surrounding area. They are completely glazed with no relief and highly reflective of light and noise.

Looking at the Landscape Plans, we note there is no additional landscaping/screening to be done in front of buildings E & F. This is very disappointing as the bulk of the trees to be removed are where Buildings E & F are. We are concerned that with the removal of so many trees to make way for these buildings, will affect us enormously as to the current existing screening looking from our home.

We note the applicant still has not addressed the visual impact at night of this development. It is going to create an enormous amount of light spill. Currently it is pitch black at night. Due to WHS requirements for retirement villages, the lights will never go out. It will still look like an ocean liner has been moored in the middle of the golf course! It appears we, the adjoining residents, will lose this amazing amenity that we currently overlook from our residences only to be robbed for the benefit of the subject retirement village.

The applicant has really made no effort to reduce the site coverage. We note that the adjoining area (in fact all of Bayview) is zoned low density residential environmentally sensitive land which means only 40% built form and 60% landscape but this development is 75% built form and 25% landscape. I would challenge 25% landscape as it is built over a concrete slab. The built form is more likely to be most of the site. We are concerned that sub soil drainage will drain water straight to the watercourse by way of sandy soil and will not allow rainfall infiltration.

The subject development is in a valley where noise carries and from our home we hear conversations and machinery on the golf course, chain saws, road noise, music and we believe this will be amplified with such a development with the loss in particular of so many trees which act as a sound barrier!!

As an adjoining resident, we are also in the subject wildlife corridor and believe we have a duty of care to protect and conserve such corridor. We live in it 24/7 and therefore speak first hand that it does exist. I say to those who do not believe it exists, do you play golf at night? This is when it truly comes alive. The nocturnal wildlife is truly amazing and we love to hear, in particular the noisy owls calls during the night.

We are very concerned as to the destruction of some 140 plus mature trees (many of which are over 50 years old in the high priority wildlife corridor. We are advised by Dr Anne Clements amended (exhaustive 600+ pages) report that by planting some 3,000 trees elsewhere around the golf course (no detail) this will be bigger and better than the existing wildlife corridor. It appears to her that the existing trees and wildlife are of no importance. This is ludicrous to consider it will be better. Trees do not grow overnight. There is no immediate benefit and we certainly will not see the results in our lifetime. The wildlife will be gone forever. Please do not allow this wildlife corridor to be destroyed.

As of the 1st October, 2018, SCC's will no longer be approved by the Department of Planning. They are being handed to the local Council's Planning Panel. There have been many concerns in particular of certain areas of being dominant in retirement villages. In the vicinity, of the Waterbrook Development we have three (3) existing retirement villages all within 1km radius of each other and the Waterbrook development would make four (4). This is clearly a dominance and abuse of the subject area.

We note that the Applicant is trying to justify that the development is in the public interest. When is a privately owned golf course and their members in public interest? It is self-interest, they are the only ones (and of course Waterbrook) who benefit from this development going ahead (sale proceeds and ongoing course renovations). Just look at the submissions received in favour of the development they are mostly the members of the golf club. We their neighbours, community and more importantly the wildlife are the ones being duped.

We agree that the Northern Planning Panel and Council got it right in refusing this development and we would urge the Land & Environment Court to refuse this Appeal.