
From: Andrew Macpherson
Sent: 12/09/2023 9:44:29 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Attention: Development Assessment DA# 2023/1068 (69 Bassett Street Mona Vale)
Attachments: Objection to 69 Bassett Street DA.docx;

Dear Development Assessment Team / Claire Ryan

Please find attached our submission regarding serious concerns about 1-2 aspects of DA# 2023/1068 recently lodged for 69 Bassett Street, Mona Vale.

We apologise for the slight delay in submission, but due to the volume and complexity of the plans lodged, it took slightly longer to review than anticipated.

Happy to discuss our concerns anytime.

Yours Faithfully

Andrew Macpherson

(One of the owners of 73-75 Bassett Street).



The Owners of
73-75 Bassett Street
Mona Vale 2103

8th September 2023

To whom it may concern

Re: Development application 2023/1068

We are writing to express our concerns with the recently proposed development at 69 Bassett Street on a couple of fronts:

1) Inadequate Provision for Off-Street Parking

The off-street parking provision for the proposed development is materially inadequate for a development of this size and type, in both the number and location of spaces proposed.

As local residents, businesses and Council are only too well aware, on-street parking on Bassett St, Tengah Cr and adjoining residential streets remains scarce and congested, and has been a highly sensitive and frustrating issue for residents and businesses alike.

We were therefore incredulous to read in the proponents Traffic Impact Assessment report that *“a site inspection indicated there was an **under-utilisation of kerb-side parking in the area**, and therefor(e) it is considered that sufficient space has been provided for...”*. This finding is completely at odds with everyone’s lived experience in the area, and calls into question the degree of rigour and objectivity applied in the production of this report.

We note the proponent has made undertakings in their pre-DA meeting to Council that their proposed use for the site is *“unique”*, and hence the normal off-street parking provisions shouldn’t apply to them. It appears they are proposing a mere 7 spots for a development that would normally require 18-20+ off-street spaces (at 1 per 40m2 GFA warehouse rate + accessible/visitor quota etc).

The Traffic Consultant has also suggested categorising the proposed use as a that of a “motor showroom”, to take advantage of this category’s lower parking provision rates. While we appreciate the proponent’s business does indeed share some of the qualities of a motor showroom, a read over the services their business provides (<https://chrometemple.com/>) reveals more of a hybrid motor enthusiasts/collectors business, which will have employees running caretaker and concierge services for owners, as well as from time to time holding events for its members &/or investors. Adding on the proposed café (with its staff/customers on-top), and the meagre proposed parking provision looks likely to exhausted before even a single potential member/investor visits.

To make matters worse, rather than locating the parking bays on ground level &/or in common circulation areas on each level (so they are convenient and readily accessible), the remaining 4 of 7 proposed spaces are located inside the four units. We suspect this is more about reducing the calculated GFA of what is a very intense development of the site, to sneak back under the permitted FSR of 1:1 (further evidenced by the very oversized nature of the single car bays inside the units), rather than a genuine intention to provide practical and usable parking for the site.

Even with the benefit of the doubt (that the proposed use is “unique” and thus requires less parking than typical industrial/business uses), should Council proceed in approving the development in its current form - it will in entrench these impractical and unenforceable internal “parking spaces” for the life of the development, and whatever future uses of the units may eventuate in time. In other words, should some/all of the industrial units revert back to “non-unique” uses one day, what will happen to these internal “parking spaces”? Presumably they will be abandoned by the future occupants (being both impractical and impeding each unit’s roller door access), leaving the meagre ground floor allocation of just 3 spaces to cater for 4 mid-sized industrial businesses and a café. The unavoidable conclusion is yet further demand will be placed on the already scarce on-street parking resources available.

Put simply why should Council simply discard well-considered governing Environmental Planning Instruments and Regulations (i.e. Council’s DCP, RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Development, etc) simply because a proponent self-assesses their initial use as being unique, in a heavily parking-congested area? Should Council begin making exceptions for one such development, it risks setting an unfortunate precedent for future applications to be able to undermine the governing regulations. It is only common sense that adequate parking provision be ensured for the intended initial use, as well as typical generic future uses likely and permissible in the zoning in such a development.

We don’t mean to be difficult - but feel strongly that should Council waive through such attempts to subvert the planning rules, it will only aggravate an already difficult situation for local residents and businesses. We would simply ask that the proponent provide a reasonable off-street parking allocation (like everybody else in the street), in readily accessible open-circulation areas, so their proposed industrial development is fit for its current (and likely future) use, without placing undue burden on scarce on-street parking.

2) Height Controls

While the proposed main building would be above the typical height limits (11M height limit and maximum FPL +10.5M), we don’t consider this unreasonable given the impact of Council’s current Flood Planning Levels and the resulting impact these have on elevating ground floor levels so accordingly. The main building height (RL 14.96) is also in-line with the recently approved Tengah Green development (RL 15.35).

However in parallel with considering the proposal for several building elements to go higher, we would ask that Council considers the precedents it will set against its overall

intentions and desired future outcomes for height limits across the Mona Vale industrial precinct at large.

Personally we do not believe a slightly higher limit would have any detrimental impact on the area or its amenity. Nor does it seem unreasonable given the increasing flood planning levels of recent years. However whatever Council decides – we would ask that it please consider reviewing and amending the planning controls accordingly, so that there are clear uniform planning rules for everyone to plan to & work within.

The alternative is for Council to continue making exceptions on a case-by-case basis, overtime effectively creating a de-facto new height control (by precedent) regardless. Why not just review what Council deems a reasonable height-limit for today's flood risks and desired character of the area, and simply formalise this in Council's controls – for the sake of greater clarity and transparency for residents and land-owners alike.

Yours Faithfully

Andrew Macpherson