

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: Central Coast Council
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: CM: DA61592/2021 16 Warrah St Ettalong Beach OBJECTION

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.

Submission Objection

DA61592/2021 16 Warrah St Ettalong Beach.

Despite the original D.A. being refused, I am yet again writing to object to this latest D.A.

I would like to point out that the Clause 4.6 written request is substantially the same that was found to be inadequate during the first assessment, and that there remains insufficient environmental planning grounds to justify a contravention to the minimum lot size.

With the growing cluster of multi dwelling townhouses on Warrah Street, comes an array of growing issues such as parking. No visitor parking is provided by number 16, or any of the new townhouses in the street. We are beginning to see street parking negatively impacted- with more pain to come for Warrah residents.

This new cluster will also dramatically increases the heat island affect due to the ever growing footprint of roofing and driveways with insufficient green space to offset this warming affect.

Shadow diagrams indicate worsening impact on neighbouring residents due to townhouse 2 and 3 being higher than the original plans. Why have the designers not listened to the concerns of neighbours who will now have even less solar access? This could have been prevented by not increasing the height of the block by unnecessary use of land fill, or better still, a design that respects the local zoning laws and rules of our local council.

Other non-compliance issues in relation to 16 Warrah include;

1. Insufficient setbacks yet again.
2. The vehicle swept path plans show cars hitting fences and don't appear to consider retaining structures along the fence line.
3. Due to poor site planning, there is no private open space to unit 2, and little to unit 1 that would meet the minimum solar access requirements of 3 hours in the middle of winter.
4. Floor to ceiling height ratios are again not to code.
5. The building length is required to be 25m but is in fact 40m. This is a variation of 60%.

Clarke Dowdle and Associates again make misleading and **false** statements in their written request for expection, when listing other addresses as examples of approvals of multi-unit developments with the same design scale, height, setbacks, site cover and parking. Many of the listed examples are in fact not the same design scale, height, and have different setbacks, site cover and parking. This argument should be totally disregarded.

The original application had 27 objections and petition with 47 signatures. This current D.A. has a growing list of submissions too. It is very clear that the residents of Warrah St and the local community do not want another development whereby three townhouses are crammed onto a block of land that is zoned for a maximum of two. In just the last couple of years we have seen six townhouses being built or approved within an 80 metre stretch of the street. (No 19, 21, 25, 20, 18 and now 16) There are also 2 other townhouses that have just been completed with no 34 also attempting to develop multi dwelling townhouses too. Would council please acknowledge there is an issue with overdevelopment of multi dwelling town houses in Warrah Street?

We implore council to listen to their community, and uphold the decision made by LPP in regards to 16 Warrah St, Ettalong Beach.

Kind regards,