

Form: DA Submission  
Reference No: 5b4af1b5caf0a  
Received: 15/07/2018 05:03:17 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 object to the above D/A on the following grounds:1. Breaches of the development guidelines set out in the original DCP57 which was adopted in its entirety into the latest Gosford LEP. DCP57 was a thoughtful, well researched document which set out the conditions that were to ensure that the John Whiteway Drive (JWD) Precinct would be sympathetic to the overall environment and maintain the residential amenity of developments in the precinct. Council and the JRPP have persistently ignored breaches of the DCP with claims that the breaches were "minor".I refer, inter alia, to the breaches of DCP57 in the development approvals for 86 JWD and 70 JWD .2. Traffic and Parking. I would be interested to learn what parallel universe the authors of the Barker Ryan Stewart traffic report were occupying when they came to the conclusions in that report. It is obvious that they were not in the real JWD precinct. One does not need to be a traffic engineer to determine that JWD in its present state is inadequate even for the existing buildings let alone what is planned. It is ridiculous that there has been no consideration of the other major developments planned or underway including, but not limited to, Nos. 70 and 86 JWD . As a single instance the requirement in respect of 86 JWD for a concrete barrier across the Henry Parry Drive (HPD) frontage of the building will put additional stress on the intersection of HPD and Georgiana Terrace and parking in JWD that have not been addressed in the traffic submission.3 Bushfire Risk. In the event of a bushfire JWD would be totally inadequate to provide safe evacuation of the existing and planned RFB's in the precinct.4. The proposed ingress and egress for the proposed development in their planned location, right on a near blind curve. Should, God forbid, this development proceed and the ingress and egress remain in their planned position, Council should insist that both ingress and egress be by left turn only.5. Significant risk to the Panorama Towers property from the proposed under-building car parking.