

Form: DA Submission
Reference No: 5b509ac9c2297
Received: 20/07/2018 12:06:01 AM
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: As an owner and resident of 91-95 John Whiteway Drive, Panorama Towers, Gosford I wish to object to the development as proposed on 87 John Whiteway Drive and put forward its impact on Panorama Towers. This is an over development of this site. Now 299 units are to be built, and this is a very large increase over the previously approved development for 177 units which is already large already. A major concern is the demolition of a rock wall close to the boundary between the 2 sites. Any disturbance to the rock wall will have a crumbling and damaging impact on the pool area and land owned by Panorama Towers. The proposed building development dangerously intrudes into the areas adjacent to fragile 20 metre cliffs, areas which are designated NON-BUILDABLE. The non-buildable areas are :a) clearly designated on title documents with precise identifying survey data; b) confirmed pictorially in Plan HOB 015CAB in LEP 2014; c) explained in Part 7.3 of City Centre DCP 2007 as protection for cliff faces. Traffic and parking is not sustainable in a 2 lane road the size of JWD. The proposed site will generate approximately 350 extra vehicles. Whilst basement car parking spaces are included in the development proposal, I have concern that this will not be sufficient. The Central Coast region is a driving region and as such each proposed unit will definitely have more than one car. This is already evident with the amount of cars parked on every available part of the road now. There is currently no on-street parking space available with the overflow of cars from the occupants of the apartments from the 4 tower buildings on Lot 80 of John Whiteway Dr. If we are to add another couple of hundred excess cars (assuming that most households have more than 1 car), there will be nowhere for these cars to be parked. Not to mention the impact of traffic trying to turn from or to Henry Parry drive onto/from Georgiana Terrace which is already a highly dangerous dangerous blind intersection. Not all residents will be young and healthy, OR inclined to walking, without public transport to this area, a car is vital. A lack of privacy for residents at the back of Panorama Towers due to the proposed development greatly exceeding height restrictions. Surrounding properties are not built above the horizon line as they are built into the hill. With the addition of 5 new towers on the top of the hill sight lines will be adversely impacted. Additional development of this scale is also not sympathetic to the nearby bushland reserve at Rumbalara. The addition of 5 tall towers on the top of the hill will adversely impact the apartments below it (91-95 and 97-99 John Whiteway Dr) by blocking their access to sunlight. Will there be appropriate drainage facilities made to ensure the appropriate disposal of stormwater? The

buildings directly below the proposed site (91-95 and 97-99) are already considered a flood risk due to run off from the hill above. John Whiteway Drive is currently considered a quiet area. With the addition of several hundred extra apartments there is the concern that it will increase noise levels in the area. In addition to this, 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. For all the above reasons I would suggest that this proposed over development is not in the Public Interest, and would urge Council not to recommend its approval to the JRPP.