
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 9/09/2024 2:17:16 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

09/09/2024

MR Daryl OConnor
39 Bilwara AVE
Bilgola Plateau NSW 2107
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2024/0303 - 337 Lower Plateau Road BILGOLA PLATEAU NSW 2107

DA2024/0303:

- This submission (unlike my previous two) focuses specifically on the actual subdivision proposal and approval process.

Engineering Referral Response (17/06/2024) with additional comments concerning the 30/08/2024 update, listed below.

* Of the four points raised in this Council's internal response in not supporting this subdivision proposal, the critical point seems to be the first point listed:

1) Access handle width and grades. As highlighted by Council's Traffic Engineers comments the access handle from Lower Plateau Road is limited in width to 4.57m, the Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan (DCP) requires a passing bay to an overall minimum width of 5m for a length of 10m with suitable transitions to be provided. It is not possible to provide a suitable passing bay within the driveway corridor as the ROW is only 4.57m so an easement for a right of way to achieve the passing bay requirements is to be obtained from the adjoining property(ies). The Pittwater 21 DCP also specifies that internal driveways are to be designed and constructed to provide safe access and shall have a maximum gradient of 1:5 (V:H). For internal driveways on steeply sloping or difficult sites, gradients may be increased up to 1:4 (V:H) over a maximum 20m length. The site gradient is approximately 1:3 (V:H) for the last 20m of the driveway corridor, which exceeds the permissible gradient.

* How can this subdivision proceed if the adjoining residents do not support an easement for the right of way to achieve the passing bay requirements?

* Similarly, the Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan (DCP) specifies acceptable gradients for driveways. The gradients in the subdivision submission do not meet those requirements. Again, how can Council approve this subdivision proposal?

Traffic Engineer Referral Response (28/05/2024)

- Similarly, from this additional report:

"According to the Pittwater DCP clause B6.2, a passing bay should be minimum 5 metres wide and 10 metres long with suitable transitions to the adjacent narrow driveway. Due to site constraints, the passing bay is not fully compliant with the Pittwater DCP and the location of passing bay is in nature strip not within the site boundary contrary to AS2890.1 which requires such bays to be located inside the property boundary of 5.5m in width and extending for at least 6m (clause 3.2.2). Council could consider approval of a slightly non-compliant passing bay as the traffic volume using this access is low, however, the swept path should be amended to show an egressing B99 passing a B85 waiting internal to the property with its swept path shown. A swept path should also be plotted for an egressing B85 passing a B99

waiting internal to the property with is swept path shown. The swept path on page 16 of the traffic report shows a propped B85 vehicle external to the property without its entry movement path from the road. The currently proposed arrangements are inadequate to be considered acceptable".

- The Council, floating the idea of non-compliance with its own DCP guidelines in favour of this proposed subdivision, would seem to be not only contradictory in the extreme but a failure in its duty of impartiality to residents.
- This report lists eight other points of concern. It concludes: "The application is not supported at this stage with further information as outlined above required prior to further consideration of the proposal. The proposal is therefore unsupported."

Traffic Engineer Referral Response - further comments dated 30/08/2024:

"It is understood that the width of driveway has been widened to facilitate the exiting vehicle giving way to the entering car. This has been reflected on the architectural plans as well. It is noted that the amended architectural plan shows passing vehicles within the property boundary and the taper length for passing has been increased to 10 metres as requested in the original referral response."

- Where are the updated, amended master set /architectural plans referred to in this latest Engineer response?
- Does the widening of the driveway impact the adjoining neighbours in any way?
- Does the widening of the driveway impact any trees not previously noted as being affected in previous reports?
- These Council reports are unequivocal on critical site access concerns. Before the Council could even get to assessing other aspects associated with this proposal (landscaping, tree canopy, arborists' reports, statement of environmental effects, flora and fauna, visual and audio privacy impact on neighbours, flood risks, riparian concerns, individual DA's for any proposed houses, traffic access volume, traffic lights impact on neighbours and other concerns) the inability to subdivide this particular block, based on Council's own guidelines would seem to make any further consideration of this proposed development a moot point.

Kind regards,
Daryl O'Connor
39 Bilwara Ave
Bilgola Plateau