

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: Central Coast Council
Subject: CM: Submission Objection DA 61592-2021 16 Warrah St Ettalong
Attachments: Submission Objection DA 61592-2021.pdf

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

Categories: [REDACTED]
Record Number: [REDACTED]

You don't often get email from garyjmachin@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[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.

To Planning Officers
I have attached my submission objection to DA 16 Warrah St Ettalong

[REDACTED]

I am a Peninsula resident of 11 years and object to DA 61592/2021

I have previously made a submission against this DA and am upset that I need to go through this process again.

I appeal to the planning officer to not allow the planning system to be undermined by development applications that are not in the public interest and have a huge impact on the amenity of residents and neighbours.

Parking:

In the original SEE there was no provision for visitor parking with the suggestion that the site was too narrow. I have seen this excuse many times before with DAs in local streets. We must not allow this to be the norm. Suggesting that there is plenty of on - street parking is short –sighted and very poor urban planning. The population is increasing so developers need to accommodate cars on the site and not inconvenience the existing residents.

If the site is too narrow then make a variation to the design.

Environment:

The leafy nature as described by Clarke and Dowdle must be retained. The incorporation of medium sized trees in the Landscape Plan is a good start but these must have good soil depth if they are to survive. The majority of the plan is low plantings.

Compliance:

It is difficult to comment on compliance without an updated SEE. We will be relying on the DA Officer to ensure compliance occurs. The POS for Unit 2 looks very compact and not conducive to liveability.

In the original SEE ,the side setbacks on the west and east were not compliant. There is no amended SEE and if the side setbacks remain non-compliant this will not allow for landscaping to give privacy to neighbours. No impact on the amenity is one of the objectives of the DCP. With a heating climate and the increase in hard surfaces, such as the immense concrete driveway and concrete paving, we need to be designing to offset this heat not exacerbate it.

Precedents given should be ignored. We must see the CCDCP as 'best practice' and build to improve our liveability not negatively affect it.

This DA is definitely not in the interest of the public and not in the interest of retaining local character.