

Mr. Gary Murphy CEO

12 April 2019

Central Coast Council

PO Box 21

Gosford 2250

Dear Sir and fellow Council Managers,

RE – DA 56190/2019                      32 – 36 Melbourne St East Gosford

I write to express concerns relating to the above DA for a property very close to my own.

Unfortunately the current DA presented is in a form that I and many residents must strongly object to. Particularly with respect to the following.

1. Design of dwellings and over utilization of site.
2. Traffic reports presented are inaccurate.
3. Water and sewer treatment is lacking.
4. Parking and Waste Collection not considered fully.
5. Residential amenity ignored.
6. Habitat for wildlife poorly thought out.

*Please note aspects of the following comments are from a local - knowledge perspective which I believe is a vital part of this process. We residents can't expect external consultants nor Council to have as much knowledge as locals. I do sincerely trust that you will take these points and images supplied on board and use them where valid to seek a far better outcome for all.*

### **1 Design of dwelling and over utilization of site;**

From the outset we see different terminology across the consultants submissions Different references – Apartments, Multi Dwelling Housing Development. Perhaps semantics. But 22 actual dwellings or habitats as I class them on a footprint that housed two homes.

This fairly over zealous grab, must place an enormous overloading impact on the current infrastructure – road network sewer and water. Well beyond, it's built purpose, yet I see nor hear of any provision for any upgrade to the associated infrastructure that will be impacted by this onerous development- why?

Plus we see the usual sneaky approach of adding just a few over height elements being applied – why ? Council have set rules for a reason please apply them to this design to maintain overall amenity.

*And who checks on the private certifier these developers tend to use – who checks the checker?*

The overall design is very much like a tightly packed camping ground with minimal access (only foot traffic) above ground to each of the proposed 22 habitats. I question access for emergency services and service providers.

Plus it appears that the developers wish to push the building alignment to within a whisker of a number of fence lines, using some obscure sub clause to sneak in a few extra metres. Will Council rule on these set back sneaks that they want?

The key building elements and colour scheme also leave me wondering if this is not another cut paste design by the Architect. It is remarkably similar in colour and asthetics to developments in Brougham, Webb and Adelaide st – brown on grey, vertical fences and garish trim. Making the local environment bland and certainly not in keeping with the general look and feel of the neighborhood. Further the aluminium roofing proposed is traditionally not held in high standing with builders who tell me in a short span of time it will loosen, rattle and generally diminish in original appearance. Add to this the fibre board walls and in quick time we'll all be looking at a shabby collection of buildings.

## **2 Traffic reports presented are inaccurate.**

Unfortunately it is quickly apparent that the consultant has used a cut and pasted from previous reports evident immediately with a reference on line 2 section 3.4 that mentions Mann st & Baker st in dialogue. So how valid is this report, was it done at all. I wonder since apparently there are no pedestrians, no buses included. Interesting when there are 5 schools and a shopping centre in close proximity. Schools that educate 2,713 students.

These reports where also undertaken supposedly on a day which was conveniently the last day prior to school holidays with 2 senior schools already away.

And 3 have no researcher mentioned – maybe they filled them in sitting in an office...and even if done give the survey day will give the applicant a more favourable statistic. These schools don't offer any off street parking for the ever increasing P plate drivers.

**Plus and very importantly. The time frames for the traffic counts are not at peak times for the streets involved.**

Over 2,700 students attend 5 schools in a 500 mtr circumference of 32 – 36 Melbourne st. Moreover I estimate that 80+% of students arrive and depart between 7.30 – 9.00 am and 2.30 – 4.00 pm by either bus (20 in each period), car under own control requiring street parking or by kiss and drop parents.

This daily activity creates over zealous parking by students (who often move bins that are not empty to park) plus daily traffic blockages along Webb st, Adelaide st (see pic) and Melbourne st.



Adelaide st towards shops



Adelaide and Webb st 3.10pm



Webb st on an average school afternoon

*This information doesn't appear on the cut and paste traffic reports, so please request a fresh report done during a regular day where students are in full attendance during the peak period for this area for a true indication. A rough count on 8/4/19 had 367 cars crossing the Webb and Adelaide intersection between 2.45 and 3.45 pm and 298 crossing Melbourne and Adelaide the same day not counting buses, between 7.45 – 8.30 am who use a route George st to Webb st AM and then Webb and Adelaide PM, plus Melbourne to Adelaide st PM..*

Without more accurate details I fear that the DA with it's one access point is going to quickly contribute to additional traffic blockages, dangerous turning scenarios and potential disaster given the number of young students moving around. A better vehicle access strategy is needed with safer less busy access possible via Melbourne st or better still 2 points of access.

### **3. Water and sewer treatments.**

Seems to have been brushed over in the DA. Yes retention tanks on sight are mentioned but does this temporarily contained water then get pumped into the local gutter much the same as the torrents we experience from the Victoria st office and retail precinct?

Further there is no mention of any upgrade to the sewer service. I ask because in a storm a few years back the pump out located behind Elizabeth Ross Park couldn't handle the additional load created by the storm and this resulted in a two day over flow of sewerage across my lawn and blocked toilet systems for 3

adjoining properties. I wonder what will happen when 22 more habitats are added to an already under performing system?

Wells and natural water flow aquifers are present on this land. The wells have been quickly covered up and filled by the demolishing crew. I'm no water expert but if you dig 2 to 3 metres below ground level to house the parking for this site, I reckon your going to create a big problems for the site during build and ongoing once completed, much like 27 Webb st has after a large cut and build of townhouses = a constant flow in wet or dry times from an aquifer that crosses this site.

This aspect is either not noted or ignored. And for mine this change in natural water course will have lasting impacts on adjoining housing all the way to the wet land environment presently being feed by this aquifer behind Elizabeth Ross Park. Left unaddressed it will have lasting impacts.

#### **4 Parking and Waste Collection**

Seems to be a level of conjecture with parking standards. Council have one rule, RMS another. So again the applicant has taken the easier option and is using RMS standard requiring just 37 parking spots and 1 disabled spot. Or is that really 36 and 1, or is it 38 in total? Either way it is below the requirements set by council. A stronger ruling would help.

Further given the proposed size of the applicants habitats it's pretty safe to assume the new residents will be using their parking spaces as storage spaces and the local road network as parking for vehicles. This happens increasingly already adding pressure to the street scape.

Consequently the temporary parking spaces on street once available soon become permanent spots causing additional hazards for kiss and park parents, students.

Waste collection becomes a nightmare because of this and the knock on effect ensures dangerous situations for those who use the area for school and shopping purposes.

Please also consider introducing parking restrictions of a nature that will still allow for safe temporary parking, but not permanent resident parking – thus forcing off street parking to be used.. And perhaps actual no parking zones for the waste collection which will equal somewhere around 20 bins (allowing for the 360 ltrs) each week.

And some consideration could be included with respect to the bike laneway set down as part of Adelaide st.

#### **5. Residential amenity.**

Developments of this nature are a gross encroachment on not only adjoining residents who may be in free standing homes or multi dwellings, someone is always peering over some else's fence often now from a height.

Additionally given the look, colour and building materials so far set out for this DA we residents and you in Council will quickly be facing another sub standard development that in my view will lower the entire amenity of East Gosford which will be a real pity.

So I urge you to force change upon the developer and those involved – across design, quantity, build, landscaping and street access.

#### **6. Habitat**

In this instance relates to animals birds and four legged creatures.

As each new development arrives we see a chain saw or earth moving machine remove almost all existing trees, shrubs from sites. Resulting in loss of habitat for an increasing number of native animals. Add to this the poor state of council owned habitat along the Caroline Bay foreshore with its over growth of Asparagus ferns, and Lantana. And animals are being forced out far quicker than necessary. Particularly when no consideration is included across landscaping on new development to include any bird or habitat attracting plantings. Perhaps Council can ask for a modified plan here as well.

*FOOT NOTE*

*Council recently changed an address on another development from the originally lodged DA for 32 – 34 Webb st East Gosford. It was changed to a new address of 1 A – Adelaide st East Gosford, because the vehicle entry point was in Adelaide St.*

*This action whilst it may seem logical for council has and continues to cause the residents of 1 Adelaide st (Me) untold levels of inconvenience. Power account switched, trades people walking into my backyard thinking that we have a granny flat, copious amounts of deliveries and trades wishing to quote for all manner of services, food delivery and Air BnB guests all interrupting at some pretty strange times.*

*Thank fully no emergency services have needed to be called, because Google and all other reference sites still have my home showing as 1A Adelaide st – very annoying as you may imagine.*

*My point - the above DA is under discussion is also known as Melbourne St Gardens and listed thus far for all intents under a Melbourne St address.*

*But if you choose to proceed with the current DA with the current access points it is fair to think that you will change the property address at the 12<sup>th</sup> hour to something in Adelaide st causing even more confusion and annoyance to which ever residential number becomes associated.*

*So would it not be better for all concerned to retain the address as 32 – 36 Melbourne St?*

Thank you for taking time to read our submission I look forward to seeing progress made towards and better outcome for all.

Kind Regards

T & G Herkess

1 Adelaide St

East Gosford 2250