
Sent: 10/02/2018 1:18:20 PM
Subject: Re: Submission to Development Application No. DA2018/0149 - 60 Binalong avenue
Attachments: DA20180149 - 60 Binalong Avenue, Allambie Heights - Stocken.pdf;

Dear sir/madam,

Please find attached our submission in relation to above referenced development.
Pls confirm receipt.

Kind rgds

Tony & Sandra Stocken

10 Southern Cross Way,

Allambie Heights,

NSW

2100

Tel. 0410 479 294

10 Feb 2018

Dear Sir/ madam,

Re: DA2018/0149 – 60 Binalong Avenue, Allambie Heights

We love Allambie Heights and have been residents here for over 20 years, we have no objection to progression and both higher density and affordable housing in this beautiful suburb as long as it is appropriate, proportioned, and compliant to the regulations. We do understand that the new hospital will likely require more short-term housing stock and this will currently stress the status quo.

That said, the development proposal DA2018/0149 planned would seem to us totally inappropriate for the location and not compliant in a number of regards:

Zoning – We understood that this site had a low density R2 Zoning classification. Our understanding is that such a commercial venture as a boarding house is not allowed under this classification.

Even if such a commercial or high density development is now allowed (we are assuming here that perhaps State prerogatives take precedent over local regulations), the high density nature (35 rooms, assuming some are double rooms, potentially upto 70 people) of this particular application is far in excess of both the site and local area amenities and service infrastructure.

Carpark space – We understand the development will provide for 7+1+1 on-site motor vehicles spaces (residents/manager/disabled), plus 14 mixed motor cycles / cycle spaces. Realistically, this is grossly undersized for potentially upto 70 people in which statistically at least 60% will have cars. We would therefore argue that at least 40 car spaces should be provided within the development. Further, according to SEPP regulations, at least 14 parking spaces should be provided according to the 0.4 / 35 no. of rooms ratio for non-accessible accommodation.

In the unlikely event that this development is to proceed 'as-is', the development would need to accommodate far more car parking spaces on site (in eg. an underground carpark) than are currently envisaged.

Landscape open space – We understand that such proposals should accommodate sufficient green space ratio for the size of building infrastructure. Viewing the drawings, the proposal does not seem to meet minimum requirements of Landscape open space – given the size of the building envelope. For a building of this size coupled with the large number of occupants, the % of available outdoor space at the rear of the development, seems grossly insufficient and not meeting either SEPP or R2 Zoning regulations. This will likely adversely impact the occupants and the immediate local community.

Accessibility – With upto 70 people, *and in fact, even if a third of this size*, we strongly argue that accessibility will be a major issue. We understand the development has been proposed on the basis/classification that it is accessible. Given the current lack of public transport services (bus in particular) in the local Allambie area, this will likely further exacerbate the

need for residents to have cars (hence the requirement to have adequate car spaces on the site).

Further, there are currently no footpaths for pedestrians at this location - so these would need to be laid before any such developments of this nature proceed, otherwise pedestrian safety will seriously be compromised.

Setting a precedent – We are concerned that this application, should it be approved in some way, will set a precedent for such inappropriate, inadequate and over-reaching developments. Clearly, the developer will profit, but all the other stakeholders (residents, local community) will be directly and adversely impacted by radically changing the character and amenity of this beautiful locality.

We sincerely hope our inputs to this development are considered carefully. Even if such a commercial development is allowed within current regulations, we strongly argue that the scale of this development would need to be radically reduced in terms of rooms/occupants, sufficient on-site parking provided, increasing infrastructure for greater accessibility and sufficient on-site building envelope to greenspace provided.

Lastly, if the original pocket of land was used in proportion to the surrounding residential properties, it would have accommodated 2 houses averaging 4 people per household ie. 8 people in total. In comparison, to accommodate say 20 people as reasonable, let alone up to 70 people is most definitely not in proportion to land size or current residential properties! New buildings not only have to aesthetically tie in with the surrounding developments, consideration has to be given to the number of people accessing the amenities and surrounding infrastructure.

Lastly, we do appreciate the opportunity to raise our objections to this development at this early stage.

Yours Sincerely

Anthony & Sandra Stocken