
Sent: 21/03/2018 10:44:18 AM
Subject: Online Submission

21/03/2018

MRS Deana Burn
44 Goondari RD
Allambie Heights NSW 2100

RE: DA2018/0149 - 60 Binalong Avenue ALLAMBIE HEIGHTS NSW 2100

I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

1. The site is unsuitable for the scale of development proposed. The surrounding area is characterised by low density (single or two storey dwellings). The Australian Bureau of Statistics 2011 data reports the average household size in Allambie/Manly Vale as 2.7 persons per dwelling. This proposal could accommodate up to 70 people over 2 residential sized blocks. There are no existing multi-unit dwellings in close proximity to this proposal. The scale and nature of the development is inconsistent with and substantially different to the existing character of the local area.
2. The development is unsuitability located with regard to its proximity to shops, services and public transport infrastructure. The development is located 300 m from a bus stop, with infrequent services. Buses to the city are only offered during peak hours and services to Manly and Warringah Mall only run once an hour during the day and on weekends. The nearest shops are 1 kilometre to the north in Allambie Heights. The Applicant assumes a low level of car ownership, with residents relying on public transport to access shops and services. Given the distance to shops and services, the development is unsuitability located to service its residents. A more appropriate planning outcome would be to locate this type of development close to shops, services and regular public transport.
3. The Applicant did not complete a socio-economic impact assessment for the development (as advised in an email from Daniel Milliken to myself on 13 March 2018). Without this information, Council is unable to adequately evaluate the proposal against Section 4.15(1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.
4. The proposed driveway is inconsistent with AS2890.1. The Applicant notes the potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians in the location of the proposed driveway. There are also existing sight distance issues in this location where Binalong Avenue, Jennifer Avenue and Nargong Road intersect. These would be exacerbated by the development and have not been addressed by the Applicant. Council's traffic department response was not available to view prior to close of the exhibition.
5. The RFS referral response was not available to view prior to the close of exhibition. It is not clear whether the proposed asset protection zones are adequate or whether the proposal meets all requirements of Planning for Bushfire Protection.
6. The proposal is not in the public interest. The proposed development has attracted significant opposition from the public, with many submissions citing concerns about safety and security. The proposal is within a quiet residential area with low visibility. Primary school aged children regularly walk home from school and the school bus stop is directly opposite the proposed development. The public are concerned the

proposed 70 person development will impact the safety and security of their children. These matters have not been considered in the Applicant's SEE.

I also note the proposal in its current form does not comply with Council's requirements for overland stormwater flows, flood planning levels, waste management guidelines and pedestrian access to bus services. Council's environmental health department has also noted other similar developments have resulted in higher parking requirements than required by the Affordable Housing SEPP, noting potential issues of noise and night time headlight glare on neighbouring properties.

Council's notification area for the application was extremely limited and did not cover the area likely to be impacted by the development. The notification area did not extend to cover all dwellings along the route to the nearest bus stop, being 300 metres from the development. This is noted in the Applicant's SEE as a key reason for the siting of this development, being its proximity to bus stops (as required by the SEPP). The notification area should have covered all dwellings along the route to the nearest bus stop.