

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 1 May 2023 10:05 AM
To: Central Coast Council; Erin Murphy
Subject: CM: Submission Objection - DA61592/2021

Follow Up Flag: Flag for follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: [REDACTED]
Record Number: [REDACTED]

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Do not click any links or attachments unless you have checked the sender and trust the content is safe. If you are unsure, please report this to I&T Service Desk via the Portal.

16 Warrah St Ettalong

I am a Peninsula resident objecting to this DA.

This DA presented by Clarke and Dowdle is asking for a review of its refusal by the LPP.

The decision by the LPP should be respected. I support the planning system and do not support this attempt to undermine the integrity of this system.

The original application saw 27 submissions against it as well as a petition signed by 47 residents. This must have been taken into account when the original refusal was issued by the LPP. The opportunity to express our concerns about the numerous non-compliances is valued.

Will those submitters now be ignored?

The officer assessing this new application is different from the earlier one, Erin Murphy, who made the correct call on refusing the application.

It appears that Clarke and Dowdle are expecting a more favourable decision?

I am objecting to this DA for reasons of non-compliance:

1. There is no visitor parking but Clarke and Dowdle state, due to the narrowness of the site, no visitor parking can be provided. They go on to state that visitor parking and service vehicle access may be provided on the existing street. This narrow road does not have the space nor any capacity to accommodate visitor street parking for all these habitations.

This is the same justification that was given in their Development Applications for 21 Burrawang St, 31 Burrawang St, 33 Burrawang St, 27 King St, 34 Picnic Pde all of which are in Ettalong.

If narrowness of the site is an issue, the designer should redesign the development to fit with the DCP requirement.

2. Private Open Space in Unit 2 is below the DCP requirement – a variation of 20%
3. The building length is required to be 25m but this is 40m – a variation of 60%, this is unacceptable.
4. Setbacks are below the requirement and will shadow impact surrounding properties
5. The Unarticulated length of the external wall should be 8m maximum. This design does not meet this requirement.
6. The ceiling height of a habitable room should be 2.7m. The first floor ceiling height is only 2.45m. This requirement is a minimum standard for all new developments

It is very disturbing that developers are designing houses that do not meet the DCP requirements and are justifying non compliances with excuses such as 'narrowness of the site.'

Clarke and Dowdle suggest a list of recent approvals of multi-unit development with the same design scale, height, setbacks, site cover and parking included.

If these are going through without objection, then that is to the detriment of our community. Let this objection be for the good of the community as a whole and not just benefit unscrupulous developers.

I would like to suggest that Clarke and Dowdle begin to follow compliance and provide more liveable housing and maintain the ambience for all people. They are undermining the standards and requirements that everyone must adhere to.

Cutting corners, reducing setbacks, reducing ceiling heights, not providing sufficient parking, reducing open space, is not acceptable. It is not in the public interest.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)