
Sent: 21/03/2018 10:12:26 PM
Subject: Online Submission

21/03/2018

MR Michael Beecham
- 13 Nargong RD
Allambie Heights NSW 2100

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

Dear Mr Milliken,

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, we will be directly affected by this development should it progress in its current design.

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

Local Character

The proposed development consists of 36 bedrooms each capable of accommodating two people. It is therefore expected that the total population for the development could be in the vicinity of 72 people.

We are concerned about the noise produced by the 72 people particularly as the outdoor recreation area shown on the plans faces in our direction a distance of approximately 40m to our backyard and family room.

We are also concerned about the overlooking into our backyard which we have just invested a lot of time in creating a space for our young children to play.

We note that the consent authority cannot refuse consent on the basis parking if at least 0.2 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 0.2 parking spaces per dwelling is sufficient allowance for off street parking to be made. 0.2 parking spaces per dwelling of upto 2 people is equivalent to 10 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.

In fact nowhere in the entire Sydney region is the level of vehicle ownership even close to a rate of 10 vehicles per 100 driving aged people. Even in the ultra-well serviced public transport hub of Chatswood, the vehicle ownership rate is 30.6, in St Leonards 37.0 and North Sydney 37.9.

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 9 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 and families owned fewer. As a result, I only have one off street parking space and park our second vehicle (perfectly normal to have two vehicles) 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.

The traffic report attached to this DA produced by Transport & Urban Planning Pty Ltd dated 17 January 2018 does not even consider the impacts of traffic on the surrounding streets. The scope of the report is clearly limited to the provision of the minimum parking spaces and driveway layout. It does not address impacts of increased traffic on the local environment, street parking, pedestrian safety, garbage collection for the site and existing residents.

Allambie Rd has periods of gridlock at the northern end even before the roadworks started. 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.

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.

According to the NSW Rural Fire Service (RFS) "Section 79BA of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 requires that a consent authority not grant approval for any development in a bush fire prone area (other than those developments covered by Section 100B of the Rural Fires Act 1997) unless the proposal complies with Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006 or the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service has been consulted on any non-compliance".

A bushfire report has been produced by Bushfire Consultancy Australia dated 25 January 2018, however we have concerns about the adequacy of this report and its conclusion.

The report identifies the vegetation to the south east as "Remnant Forest". This however does not align with the definition of "Remnant" in the PBP 2006 as the bushland area is greater than 1Ha and has a fire run well in excess of 50m up the valley. The application of "Rainforest" therefore needs to be questioned especially given other bushfire reports produced in the past for other residents indicating the same bush to be "Forest".

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.

If the application of "Forest" was applied, the resulting APZ would increase to 50m. The design should be modified to accommodate this APZ.

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