

Form: DA Submission  
Reference No: 5b4809cb968cd  
Received: 13/07/2018 12:09:15 PM  
Development Application: 011.2018.00054602.001  
Applicant: ADG Architects

Description: Residential Flat Building 299 Units in 3 Stages. Stage 1 Site Preparation & Earthworks. Stage 2 Residential Flat Building (Block A, B & C) and Basement Car Parking Spaces. Stage 3 Residential Flat Building (Blocks D & E) and Basement Car Parking Spaces JRPP

Comments: I am the owner of Unit 30 Panorama Towers, 91-95 John Whiteway Drive Gosford and have been since that building was completed. I have a number of concerns with this particular development which I discuss below. My first and indeed a major concern is its impact on John Whiteway Drive (JWD) which has not been either properly or adequately dealt with in the Traffic Parking Report lodged with Council. In considering this submission I would draw Council's attention to my submissions in relation to DA 2015/47044.001 Reference No. 54fa682ddf9da received by Council on 7 March 2015 DA 2015.002 Reference No. 5b177604033c5 in which I made certain comments in relation to traffic matters in JWD arising from that DAs. Those comments are equally applicable to those contained in this submission and therefore I respectfully ask that Council consider them in relation to this submission as if they were originally made herein. Additionally I have concerns about vehicular access to the development both during and after completion, potential damage during excavation and run-off from the site during and post completion. TRAFFIC & PARKING ON JWD During my ownership of Unit 30, I have seen absolutely nothing done to properly manage the traffic flow JWD in relation to DA 47044 or at all. DA 47044 envisages some 70 plus units whilst the DA under present consideration envisages 299 additional units. The increased volume of traffic on JWD which will be generated by these developments seem to have been largely ignored by the developers of both projects. The developer of DA47044 stated in its application that it is apparent that the proposed development will not have adverse traffic/safety implications on the existing road network. The developer of DA54602 uses such expressions as "The development is considered to have negligible effect on the safety and operating outcome of the surrounding transport network." Having read the Traffic Parking Report lodged with the present DA, I can only conclude that the author of that report did not spend much or indeed any significant time examining the surrounding road system or the local transport system. The information contained in that report does not seem to support the conclusions drawn. In my opinion comments on traffic directional flows are inconsistent with the realities. This is abundantly clear from simply walking the area. Also statements such as "The intersection of Henry Parry Drive and Donnison Street is currently operating near capacity, however model output shows that the estimated traffic flow from the proposed development do not (sic) have a significant impact on the intersection performance. There would be no warrant to upgrade the road

network as a result of any additional traffic generated by the development. • These two latter statements are inconsistent with each other. Indeed I suggest that an inspection on foot by a reasonably intelligent person would not support the views reported in the Traffic Parking Report. The Report also suggests that the site is also located within walking distance to Gosford CBD. This may be true in an area relatively flat and using "as the crow flies" as measurement. However JWD and surrounds is quite hilly and the hills are quite steep. Walking is not only not easy for older people but I submit it is not easy for the majority of people irrespective of age. I cannot see how the Report can reasonably state that "Overall the existing site has excellent access to pedestrian and cycling infrastructure which can accommodate the requirements of the proposed development." This statement is clearly wrong. So far as parking is concerned, Council's parking standards have proven to be grossly inadequate for JWD. This is demonstrated by the number of vehicles illegally parked on this narrow and largely unlit road. I refer to my comments above in further support of this contention. As Council is aware, an increase in density has been approved for Lot 100 DP 1039621 No. 86 JWD with no increase in parking requirements. This proposed building has its vehicle entrance Henry Parry Drive and a pedestrian entrance on JWD. I believe that as a condition of approval the centre concrete barrier on Henry Parry Drive is to be extended in front of the proposed building which will result in all buildings exiting the site to turn left and thus away from the city centre. I expect that this may well encourage residents and guests of residents of the building to park on JWD in the vicinity of Panorama Towers, 91-95 JWD. This would further exacerbate the poor carrying capacity of JWD. The present DA is silent on the impact of this approved development. It must be taken into account by the present developer when assessing the impact of present. Indeed, the Traffic Parking Report should be amended to take into account the impact of the approved development referred to above. Unless this is done the Traffic Parking Report is clearly misleading and deceptive to say the least. Council must ensure that the developer of the DA under consideration takes steps to ensure that the safety of JWD is not further compromised.

**VEHICULAR ACCESS TO DEVELOPMENT** It is noted from the developers submission that the entrance to and exit from the proposed building's under-building car park appears to be in JWD close to the Panorama Towers entrance/exit, on an almost blind bend in the already narrow roadway. The inadequate width and restricted vision of JWD being in the middle of a bend in the road suggests that it will be virtually impossible for heavy vehicles i.e. garbage trucks, removal vans, delivery vehicles etc. to safely stop on the road and/or to safely enter and exit from the development. This would impose unnecessary and indeed dangerous restrictions on access to and from Panorama Towers.

**POTENTIAL DAMAGE DURING EXCAVATION** It is noted from the DA that the developer intends excavating to provide two level underground car parking areas in the proposed building. The plans lodged with DA indicate that proposed Blocks A and C in particular are very close to the boundary between the site of the proposed development and Panorama Towers with the latter being significantly lower than the proposed Blocks. There will clearly be significant excavation on this site; 4 separate Blocks, 2 levels of below ground parking

plus landscaping etc. However, in the DA the developer does not appear to have addressed the issue of possible damage to the Panorama Towers site during the excavation process. Nor has it addressed the issue of site run-off onto the Panorama Towers site or vibration damage to the rock wall on the boundary. There are real risks that need to be identified and addressed by the developer. They must be properly managed from the very day of commencement and the developer must be under a positive legal obligation to not only manage the risks but also to promptly and efficiently rectify and remedy any and all damage arising. Such obligation must be such as it may be enforced by the Panorama Towers Owners Corporation if this should prove to be necessary. SITE RUN-OFF & DRAINAGE I also note that the plans lodged with the DA do not appear to address the issues of site run-off from the site under consideration. The developer must be subject to a positive legal obligation enforceable by the Panorama Towers Owners Corporation to take all reasonable steps to properly and effectively mitigate any and all run-off from the development.