
Sent: 6/10/2016 10:55:39 AM
Subject: Online Submission

06/10/2016

MS Kelsey Hunter
2 / 1125 - 1127 Pittwater Road RD
Collaroy NSW 2097

RE: DA2016/0933 - 51 / 1 - 5 Collaroy Street COLLAROY NSW 2097

To: Development Assessments

We refer to DA 2016/0933 regarding the proposal to build a swimming pool and operate a swim school at 51/1-5 Collaroy Street, Collaroy (the Application), and associated documents.

We are the owner/occupier of the residential unit at 2/1125 Pittwater Road, Collaroy. Our unit is immediately adjacent and overlooks the ground floor and car park area of the premises at 1-5 Collaroy Street, Collaroy.

We have a number of concerns about the Application and we urge Northern Beaches Council to refuse the proposed development accordingly. Our objections are set out below:

(1) The location is unsuitable for the proposed development purpose

At the outset, we submit that the location is unsuitable for the proposed development purpose.

This is a fact that seems to have been conceded by the Applicant, who has submitted their Application 'based on our practical experience of 30 existing swim schools, the majority of which are in warehousing / industrial and bulk retail areas' (section 3.1 of the Applicant's Statement of Environmental Effects (Statement)). Similarly, in section 3.2 of the Statement, the Applicant notes that 'the majority of the swim schools are located in bulk, retail, warehousing and service/light industrial areas'.

We would agree that warehousing / industrial and bulk retail areas are more suitable for this development than the suburban high density residential location as proposed in the Application, and would suggest that this is why recent approval of Jump! swim schools in suburban high density residential location appears unprecedented. There are good examples of suitably located swim schools, within non residential areas, within the Northern Beaches Council area at Warriewood, Terrey Hills and Belrose.

(2) Inadequate Parking

The applicant's submission nominates the scope of the business as follows:

- Up to two swimming classes of four children
- 30 minute classes
- Maximum of 2 staff (albeit, the Application contemplates two classes operating at one time, and it would be reasonable that there would also be an admin/supervisor/receptionist, so it is likely there may be 3 staff members)
- Operating hours 8am to 8pm, Monday through to Sunday

To meet the parking needs, an area containing maximum 8 spaces (4 x tandem spaces) is nominated by the applicant.

The number of parking spaces is clearly insufficient and the location unsuitable for the proposed development purpose.

Assuming that 3 staff occupy 3 of the tandem car parking spaces for their entire shift (which, in and of itself, is inconvenient and impractical), this will only leave a maximum of 5 spaces for client use (which, practically speaking, will translate to 4 spaces for client use).

With the Applicant contemplating two classes of four children operating at any one time, the parking demand will require 8 parking spaces minimum to simply service the clientele of one 30 minute session. This means the 4 spaces available (after accounting for staff) will not be enough even for the first class. This will then involve eight vehicles arriving prior to their session commencing, 4 looking for parking and unable to park, and hence congestion conditions will prevail.

In addition, the Applicant has failed to account for client 'change over' periods between swim sessions. The Applicant has assumed that parents will not park and attend the 30 minute swimming session, but will drop off and pick off their young children. This is unlikely to be the case, given the short duration of the session. The client change over period between swim sessions will not be quick. Parents will typically elect to shower and redress their children following a session (noting that there is only 1 open shower and one toilet provided in the Application so that there is likely to be delays), meaning that available parking spaces will remain occupied beyond each session conclusion and will not be available for immediate occupation by the next session attendees.

The Applicant has submitted that their proposed parking is sufficient, as it equates to suggested car spaces for alternative developments such as child care and squash courts. Child care can be distinguished as this is typically utilised by parents while they are at work - that is, parents will drop off and pick up their kids after an entire day (rather than every 30 minutes). In addition, recommendations that squash courts have 3 spaces per court actually factors in one vehicle more than the amount of patrons utilising the facility. The equivalent for this scenario would be at least 1.5 - 2 parking spaces per available swim spot (eg, 16 parking spots). Finally, the Applicant has referred to recommendations for parking for educational facilities, which is 1 space per staff member plus adequate pickup / set down area. The Applicant has then concluded that this would be 2 spaces (for 2 teachers), failing to address what would constitute an adequate pickup / set down area.

Primary access to the ground floor (under residential units) parking spaces is from Collaroy Street. The proposed four car spaces are at the very rear of the premises and are not visible from the street front. Hence the driver/s will enter the underground parking zone before confirming that all of the available spaces are occupied. The parking zone is also tight and exiting vehicles may need to reverse out of the driveway back onto Collaroy Street to find alternative parking. Note this will also be difficult as street parking spaces in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development are already fully utilised by residents in the area. Access onto Collaroy Street can also be hazardous with restricted visibility (parked cars etc) and rapidly approaching vehicles travelling down the hill.

Parking in the street is already at a premium, particularly as the weather warms and patrons visit the beach (with Collaroy Street directly opposite the beach, ocean pool and children's playground area). This will be particularly problematic on the weekends, on which days the Applicant has suggested the swim school is most likely to operate at its peak capacity (section 3.2 of the Statement).

We further note that in its Statement, the Applicant has stated that 'the site is ideally

located in a growth area'. The proposed parking is clearly insufficient for current needs, let alone fit to withstand any future growth.

Parking needs also extend to delivery vehicles, pool chemical, service contactors etc. We note that the Applicant is required to submit certain information for a Change Of Use Application, including: the type, size and quantity of foods to be made or transported, and carparking loading and unloading facilities. Such information is not included in the Application.

Finally, we note that the Applicant is required to submit a traffic and parking analysis / report as this is a development application for commercial / business / industrial / mixed use, and has failed to do so.

(3) Child Safety Risk

The proposed development poses a high risk to safety associated with vehicle/pedestrian interaction in the congested parking zone with the arrival of vehicles with young children and associated equipment, eg prams, strollers, change bags etc. There will be the potential for clients who arrive and find no suitable parking spaces to 'double park' and unload their vehicles of children and equipment to avoid the inconvenience of waiting until they have found suitable parking elsewhere. This has the potential to place small children, prams etc in a congested parking zone with reversing & manoeuvring vehicles - an undesirable combination for pedestrian safety.

In addition, as aforementioned, access onto Collaroy Street can also be hazardous with restricted visibility (parked cars etc) and rapidly approaching vehicles travelling down the hill.

(4) Noise Concerns

The combined commercial premises / parking zone on the ground floor of 1-5 Collaroy Street is a predominantly concrete structure open to the east (facing our unit).

This open, concrete shell structure (with no sound absorbers) means that any noise is amplified and resonates to the surrounding residential properties having an adverse impact upon adjacent residents who have an entitlement to reasonable amenity. We are aware of recent complaints which have been made to the police about noise from teenagers gathering in this same parking lot on rainy nights, as every conversation is amplified and carries into adjacent properties.

We have concerns that noise resulting from the operation of the swim school may potentially constitute a public nuisance.

We note that the Application fails to adequately address potential noise impacts, with the Application merely stating that given the swim school is the same size as a domestic swimming pool, 'noise is virtually non existent'. This is, frankly, an unsatisfactory submission which:

- provides no logical or scientific reasoning to support the conclusion;
- fails to account for noise from children partaking in swim classes. The Application provides that this is not a 'typical public pool where children are making a lot of noise and are running around without being properly supervised'. Again, the Application does not provide any information to support this differentiation from 'typical public pools'. In fact, we note that given the Application appears to suggest that there may be only 2 staff members supervising 8 children (with no parents around for the duration of the classes as it assumes parents would have 'dropped off' their children), adequate supervision is questionable;
- fails to account for noise from families entering and exiting the classes, particularly

in a concrete, open parking lot very close to residential properties;

- fails to account for fan and other ventilation noise; and
- seeks to rely on experience from other swim schools, which are not in comparable residential areas.

We further note that the Applicant has failed to provide a Noise Assessment as required for an industrial development, and that James Montgomery of the Northern Beaches Council has in his Environmental Investigational Referral Response recommended that the proposal is unacceptable on this basis. Mr Montgomery has also commented that 'swim schools generate substantial noise issues'.

If the Applicant seeks to commission a Noise Assessment, we respectfully submit that this should account for noise attributed to increased use of the parking lot by young children, not just use of the swimming pool.

(5) Unsuitable Operating Hours - Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity

The applicant proposes operating hours 8am to 8pm seven (7) days a week with associated vehicle movements, congestion and noise. This is excessive for premises enclosed within a high density residential precinct - and aimed at young children (how many young children will be swimming at 7pm in the evening?)

A significant increase in pedestrian and vehicle movement as per the proposed development, particularly after 6pm and on weekends will have a negative impact upon residential amenity.

A review of the Jump Swim web site, <http://jumpswimschools.com.au/>, shows existing Jump Swim schools established in the Sydney Metropolitan area at the locations itemised in Table 1: below, including one at Belrose within the Northern Beaches Council area.

All these recently approved Jump Swim Schools are located in large business or bulky goods precincts, which are more suitable for this type of development. Their location does not have the adverse impact upon adjacent residential amenity as what is proposed at Collaroy.

The table below also lists the hours of operation, as per the Jump Swim School web site, for each of these existing ventures. The operating hours of these existing swim schools, which are more suitably located re parking and non residential proximity are less than what has been proposed by the applicant. The existing Jump Swim School locations operating hours are typically the Monday to Friday 9.00 am to 6pm, Saturday morning only and predominantly closed on Sundays

Table 1:

Belrose: Located in Business Park/ Bulky Goods precinct: M- F 8.30/9.00 am to 6pm, Sat: 7.30am - 12.30 pm, Sunday: 8.00 am - 11.30 am

Bella Vista: Located in Norwest Business Park: M - F 9 am - 12, 3.30- 6pm Sat: 8.30am -12, 3-4pm Sunday: Closed

Campbelltown: Located in Bulky Goods Centre precinct: M-F 9.00 am - 5.30/6pm Sat: 8.30am -12 Sunday: Closed

Guildford: Located in Yennora District Business Centre: M-F 9.30/10am - 6.30pm Sat: 9am - 6pm Sunday: Closed

Seven Hills: Located in Powers Road Business Park: M-F 9.00 - 6.30pm Sat: 7.30 am - 1pm Sunday: Closed

Council should, at the very least, limit the hours of operation to 9am - 6pm Monday to Friday, 8.30am to 12pm Saturday, with closure on Sundays.

(6) Inadequate Client Amenities

The Applicant provides for only one unisex toilet and one open shower facility for not

only the children but also the parents attending the swim school. This is inadequate and does not provide sufficient contingency or privacy for small children.

(7) Adequacy of Pool Water Bunding & Drainage

Above ground pools with thin plastic liners (particularly heated pools) will inevitably leak.

What provision has been made to adequately bund the pool to capture water leakage and plumb to sewer waste?

(8) Adequacy of Ventilation and Dehumidification systems

The Applicant does not appear to provide any ventilation or dehumidification system details.

The heated indoor pool will produce a high humidity environment that will need to be vented to atmosphere. This would typically require the constant operation of an extraction fan device. To where will it be vented and hence what impact upon adjoining residents re chemical odours, high humidity air and constant fan noise?

(9) Waste Disposal

We note that the Applicant is required to submit certain information for a Change Of Use Application, including waste management and storage area. The Applicant has failed to address how it intends to dispose of chemical waste.

(10) Privacy

The Applicant has stated in its Statement that the development will provide 'casual security surveillance over adjoining premises' (section 3.2). No further detail is provided about this proposed surveillance.

Given there are adjoining properties with balconies, we would request further detail about the planned surveillance to ensure there are no privacy concerns.

(11) Necessity of development

The Applicant has submitted that the school will have a positive impact on the surrounding areas as it provides a 'much needed facility', provides local job opportunities, and represents an investment into the area.

The Northern Beaches has many similar swimming facilities in surrounding areas, (including a new offering in Warriewood), so we dispute the submission that the facility is 'much needed'. In particular, we note that the Northern Beaches Council has recently invested in refurbishing and extending Manly pool, which is only 20 minutes drive away and offers learn to swim classes.

To the extent the proposal provides local job opportunities, this would be limited to 2 or 3 staff on the Applicant's own submission, so we respectfully submit that this should not weigh heavily in the decision to approve the Application.

The Applicant has also submitted that the Application will 'contribute to the mix and vibrancy of the different land uses of the neighbourhood', though it is not clear what is meant by this and what benefit this provides.

(12) Concerns raised by other local residents

We have had the opportunity to consider objections lodged by other local residents on the Council website to date. We agree with these objections. In particular, we note that the objection raised by Matthew Panozzo, which raises issues relating to the plans, the so-called 'Road to Fielding Street', and previous vandalism and graffiti. Mrs M Joanna has made the comments that it appears that the Applicant has 'not thought this through'. We have similar concerns. In fact, we note that Klaas Meekel's letter to Northern Beaches Council dated 1 September 2016 refers to a proposed swim school in 'Woolgoolga', not Collaroy. We have concerns that the Applicant has rushed the Application, or has attempted to emulate a prior application, without accounting for the specific needs of locals and impact on this particular surrounding

area.

We strongly urge Northern Beaches Council to refuse the proposed development accordingly.

If Northern Beaches Council is minded to approve the development notwithstanding the matters contained in this letter, we would appreciate being provided with information about how to appeal that decision.

Regards

Kelsey & Bruce Hunter

2/ 1125 Pittwater Road, Collaroy, NSW