



89 McCarrs Creek Rd.,
Church Point. N.S.W. 2105.
7th October 2018.
Email: tinbir@hotmail.com

The General Manager,
Northern Beaches Council,
P.O. Box 882,
MONA VALE. 1660.

Dear Sir,

Re; DA2017/1274 – Amended Plans. Seniors Housing Development.
52 Cabbage Tree Road & 1825 Pittwater Road, Bayview.

I wish to strongly object to the Amended Plans for the above Development Application, the original of which was refused by Council & Refused by the Sydney North Planning Panel on the 8th August, 2018.

I attach a copy of my initial submission & advise that my objections remain the same. The Amendments to the Plan are relatively minor & hardly change the footprint of this excessive 7 building Development. The overall bulk & scale remains the same & is not compatible with the existing & future character & density of the area. The loss of about 130 mature trees in this important valuable wildlife corridor is unacceptable.

The Amended Development is not in the Public Interest; more very expensive Seniors Housing is not required & the Community should not be asked to sacrifice our precious environment to bail out a financially fragile private golf club.

I urge you to refuse this Amended Development Application.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janet Tinkler".

Janet Tinkler.

Encls.



89 McCarrs Creek Rd.,
Church Point. 2105.
12th February 2018.
Email: tinbir@hotmail.com

The General Manager,
Northern Beaches Council,
P.O. Box 882,
MONA VALE. 1660.

Re: DA2017/1274. Seniors Housing Development.
Bayview Golf Club. Cabbage Tree Road, Bayview.

I wish to strongly oppose the 2nd Development Application for 95 Units in 7 buildings on part of the Bayview Golf Course.

It is disappointing to see, once again, the Department of Planning issuing a Site Compatibility Certificate for a revised DA without viewing the site. We are told this is "Desk Top Planning". A small reduction in height from 5 stories to 4 & 3 does not alter the overall bulk & resultant damage to the environment from a 2h site containing 7 buildings & associated roads & structures, with 3 levels of basement excavation.

I object on the following grounds;

The proposed development for Seniors Housing (or a Retirement Village, this is not clear), does not comply with the RE2 Private Recreational Zone in the Pittwater LEP, which requires the land to be used for open space or recreational purposes. The DA should immediately fail from this first test.

The Scientific Study, the Burcher Report, states the subject site is within a "High Priority Area essential to fauna movement" & recommends no increase in existing development in High Priority areas.

The project requires the removal of about 130 mature trees, described in reports as healthy. Although the DA recommends replanting trees at the completion of the project, which could be up to 2 years, there is no guarantee this will occur. It will take decades for young trees to reach maturity on this beautiful sloping site.

The building height limit for the site under the Pittwater LEP 2014 is 8.5m. All 6 residential blocks of units contravene the controls varying from 9.8m to 15.83m. Amazingly, the Applicant claims the LEP & the Seniors SEPP will be "better achieved" if the height increase is allowed.

The bulk & scale of the proposed works is not compatible with neighbouring development. The dominant form of housing in this area is extensive low density detached housing, often on large blocks of land. The Applicant refers to & makes comparisons with Bayview Gardens Village located close by, but it is not representative of the area & it is not built on a golf course. A viewing of Bayview Gardens shows it is architecturally different & the much lower profile on the sloping land allows the Village to blend into the environment in a more appropriate way.

In the many Submissions to the Council approving of this Seniors Housing/Retirement Village development, it is stated there is a great need for more Retirement Villages to service the older & ageing population. I dispute this. In a 10k radius of the site there are 17 Retirement Villages & within about 2k there are 4. This does not include Nursing Homes. As an older person I am aware

that more people would prefer to stay in their own homes now. I also think Units with a price tag of 2 million plus with high Leasehold overheads will not be as attractive as the Applicant believes. In addition, the Applicant states they will be operating a "Retirement Village" with nursing services but there is no provision in the plans for any area of nursing care, which I believe is required for a SEPP2004 DA & which most people entering a Retirement Village would require.

The sole reason for this Proposed Development is because the Bayview Golf Club is in a "fragile financial position". I have read the Book detailing the Club's history for the 50 years from the late 20's to the late 90's. Over the years it has been constantly in a fragile position & has sold land to maintain operations. The Club also built a \$7 million Clubhouse in 2005 which may have contributed to their fragile financial position. I do not consider this project is in the Public Interest. The general public should not be in the position of having to sacrifice the environment to bail out a cash strapped Private Golf Club. The viability of the Golf Club in the future is not assured. It may be that in another few years they will need to sell more land to stay afloat.

There are many other concerns. Briefly some of them are;

Additional traffic movements on very busy Cabbage Tree Road & the surrounding area. The truck movement information to remove the excavation material appears understated. The effect of noise & dust from earthworks & trucks on neighbouring properties has not been addressed

The massive bulk excavation for 3 levels of basement parking & road works down to "approximately 12.6m". The depths may be deeper because there are recommendations in the DA reports that some footings may have to be founded on solid bedrock. This in itself may interfere with the water table.

Water management on this flood prone site is critical. The site was originally a swamp which has been raised & changed very significantly over the 70 years it has been a golf course. Much of the detail provided in the report has been taken during the current very dry period. It is not clear to me from the DA that the Golf Course improvement will necessarily be implemented.

The Proposal does not comply with the object of the EPA Act 1979 which states in part as being, to encourage " the protection of the environment, including the protection & conservation of native species & plants including threatened species & ecological communities & their habitat."

This large high project, in a wildlife corridor, will require a lot of lighting at night, which of course is the time when most of our native species are abroad.

There are many commercial enterprises proposed in the Central Building, such as winery, cinema, cafe, restaurant, bar etc. These activities are not permissible in a RE2 Zone.

As a matter of urgency, I ask the Council to demand from the Developer, the installation of height poles & outline guidelines on site so that the general public can see clearly the dimensions of the project. I assume the Members of the Panel who will determine this DA will also require this, otherwise how can they properly assess the impact it will have on the environment?

Yours sincerely,

Janet Tinkler.