
Sent: 9/12/2018 1:21:12 PM
Subject: Submission re DA2018/0149
Attachments: DA2018_0149 Objection_Beecham amended plans.pdf;

Hi,

Please find attached submission regarding DA2018/0149 – 60 Binalong Avenue Allambie Heights NSW 2100

Regards,
Michael Beecham

7/12/2018

Mr Michael Beecham
13 Nargong Rd
Allambie Heights, NSW 2100

Re: DA2018/0149 – 60 Binalong Avenue Allambie Heights NSW 2100

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed development at 60 Binalong Avenue, Allambie Heights.

As residents of Nargong Rd two houses up from the proposed site in Nargong rd, our family will be directly affected by this development should it progress.

We have many concerns regarding the proposed development which I have detailed below.

Local Character

The amended plans show the proposed development is 32 rooms each capable of accommodating two people. It is therefore expected that the total population for the development could be in the vicinity of 64 people. This is certainly not in character with the local area which predominantly consists of single family homes per block.

The proposed development while reduced from the original plans, still represents a bulk of building structure with associated facades and high roof lines that is out of character with the surrounding dwellings such as ours 2 houses from the proposed development. Despite the revised design with increased setbacks and narrow access separation on Nargong rd, the design still represents a concentration of built form with minimal attempt to disguise as separate dwellings.

We also note that the consent authority cannot refuse consent on the basis parking if at least 0.5 parking spaces are provided for each boarding room. The consent authority can however refuse consent on the impact the traffic and safety issues will have on the local character.

I have not been able to locate any science behind the SEPP ARH determination that 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling is sufficient allowance for off street parking to be made. 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling of upto 2 people is equivalent to 25 vehicles per 100 people. These are just minimum provisions to be made but do not assert to be the actual number of vehicles associated with the site.

Bureau of Statistics data from the most recent 2016 census that suggests vehicle ownership in the Allambie area is closer to 97.5 vehicles per 100 people aged 18-84 (similar age group to affordable housing residents). This is clearly a more realistic expectation.

The fact of the matter is, regardless of what the SEPP says, there will be in the order of 50+ vehicles associated with the residents of the development and with only 19 parking spaces provided off-street, the remainder will be forced to street park along with existing residents

vehicles in surrounding streets never designed for this level of **traffic**. This level of traffic and traffic **noise** is not consistent with the existing local character.

I note that Nargong rd in particular is only approximately 7.9m wide. A typical parked vehicle requires around 2.1m of width (or upto 2.5m max legal width). Two vehicles parked on either side would therefore occupy at least 4.2m out of the 7.9m, with a remaining 3.7m for traffic. 3.7m is insufficient for two way traffic and will result in collisions and damage to vehicles including my own. How will I recover the costs and expenses of damage?

My particular house was built at a time when vehicles were smaller. As a result, I only have one off street parking space and park our second vehicle on the street. With this development I will need to compete for parking, or park a long way from my house walking young children down a crowded street. This is a complete change to the current local character.

Jennifer Avenue and Binalong Avenue share similar dimensions and traffic concerns. Binalong in particular includes a slope, bend and unbroken white line that will further restrict available parking space, or more likely encourage illegal and dangerous behaviour.

I have serious concerns for the safety of my children and fellow residents from this issue. Something that is not present in the current local character of the area.

Allambie Rd has periods of gridlock in the morning and afternoon at the northern end. The addition of even more vehicles to the area will only compound the traffic issues. I note that the public transport so relied upon for this development also shares the same single lane road, and as such is little help for getting workers to the hospital precinct or southbound to Warringah Mall. The public transport is also infrequent at night time and on the weekend.

Bushfire

As residents of the same street as the development, we are well aware the site falls within the Category 2 Bushfire Prone Land zone boundary due to the adjoining Kentwell Rd Reserve bushland to the south and east of the development site. The site is also designated as Land Adjoining Public Open Space. Living so close to the bushland is a pleasure but also comes with it a responsibility to adhere to the requirements of construction on bushfire prone land.

I note that the council has confirmed that in lieu of an alternative bushfire report they cannot pursue this issue any further. The fact is that an alternative bushfire report was produced in September 2011 for the property next door at 15A Nargong rd. Refer to <https://eservices.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/ePlanning/live/Common/Output/LoadAppPropDoc.ashx?id=6D%252bOPQthU18%253d> for details. In this report the same bushland was clearly classified as Forest.

The bushfire report produced by Bushfire Consultancy Australia dated 25 January 2018 identifies the vegetation to the south east as "Remnant Forest". This however does not align with the definition of "Remnant" in the PBP 2006 which says "*Remnant vegetation is a parcel of vegetation with a size of less than 1ha or a shape that provides a potential fire run directly toward buildings not exceeding 50m.*"

The bushland to the south of the subject site is well in excess of 1ha (closer to 1.9ha) and the fire run towards the site is in excess of 50m (closer to 275m) and therefore must be classified as Forest.

This is a major failing of the RFS for not enforcing their own rules in this case.

The Biodiversity Management Plan by GIS Environmental Consultants dated 31 January 2018 attached to this DA says, "The original vegetation on the site and the adjacent reserve was Coastal Sandstone Gully Forest". This type of vegetation is most closely associated with the definition of Dry sclerophyll forests with Shrubby sub formation. In effect even their own experts report contradicts the assessment of vegetation type.

The application of Forest would change the asset protection zone (APZ) requirement and hence the compliance of this development. The council may take advice from the RFS however, at the end of the day the councils is liable to ensure that the development complies with the regulations regardless of the RFS input.

We look forward to your sensible consideration of our and other residents' concerns and oppose this development in this location for the benefit of our community.

Yours sincerely

Michael and Amanda Beecham