

1. This will be the first commercial development in the street with the major implication on the housing valuations.
2. The proposed child care centre raises a number of negative points :
 - a. Traffic- additional traffic movements of approx. 70 cars (30 children morning and afternoon, + 4 staff + cook (kitchen?) + director (office?) (6 staff x 2=12).

As the street adjoins the Widemere Primary school, parents park in our street and in Gardenia Parade to drop off, pick up, children on every school day. This is usually on both sides of the street, making it narrow for passing traffic. Additional traffic load from the child care at these times will increase the risk of an accident or child being struck. For example, a car and a bicycle cannot pass within the 1 metre safety space, while cars are parked on both sides of the street as they do now. This zone will be extended down the street if child care patrons park in the street during child care pick up and drop off. This is a real concern to senior drivers .

b. Parking

- (i) Please explain the calculation for parking and compliance. The EIS Section 3 (page 50) refers to the DCP that requires 7.5 spaces for visitors + 2 for teachers but the plan has 6 for visitors and 4 for the teachers. Also "All staff parking to be provided onsite" on page 59 of the EIS. I do not see how this complies? Will there be only 4 teachers? Which 2 will park on the street or share a car or catch a bus or cycle? Is there another person who cooks in the kitchen?
 - (ii) Further 3.2- "In addition, a compliant >1.5m wide landscaped setback will be provided between the driveway and the adjoining common western boundary." What western boundary?
 - (iii) The assumption that all parents will drive down the street, enter a tight, below ground parking space, struggle with their children (in cases where there is more than child), proceed to a lift, and sign in, then return to the car, manoeuvre out of the car park is highly questionable in practice. More than likely, as I would do, parents will park at the nearest vacant spot at street level, (where there is more door room, and enter at street level. This means additional parking within the street, narrowing the usable width of the street.
- c. Setback- the child care centre appears to be closer to the front of the road than other houses, and the common acceptance in the street was that the setback was much further back, than proposed. One neighbour had a DA for a carport rejected due to setback rules.
 - d. Verandah-on front on the first floor- what is this for? This seems to be un-necessary and overlooking the neighbour's property.
 - e. Waste- the waste management plan refers to Units /Strata and not for this type of development. How much waste will be generated? Where will the waste be stored? It did not appear to be on the plan and there is no space on street for this to be held in non-obtrusive position.

f. Noise – the acoustic report states

- (i) 5.2. Indoor Play “Based on an internal reverberant sound pressure level of 90 dBA within the largest internal play areas, the predicted cumulative LAeq(15minute) noise level at the residential receivers adjacent to the proposed centre with the proposed internal configuration and associated capacity, is **52 dBA with windows open**. Noise emissions to the level at the residential receiver is predicted to be **42 dBA with the glazing closed**. The recommended assessment criterion of **39 dBA** will be achieved with the windows closed at all sensitive receivers with recommendations in this report.”-

Does this mean that the adjoining residents will need to have our windows closed to maintain peace and quiet? Surely this is an unacceptable outcome? The EIS in 4.4 refers to cross ventilation as the centre is designed to have cross ventilation. How will the cross ventilation (assuming this is fresh air) be achieved with the windows closed?

- (ii) 5.3.2 “With 31 children engaged in outdoor play on the site, the predicted maximum LAeq(15minute) noise levels are expected to be in the order of **57 dBA** to the north and south, **47 dBA** to the west (public school play area) and **below 30 dBA** to the east site boundaries and school classrooms. The proposed outdoor play area shows exceedance with criteria with all children engaged in outdoor play at some of the sensitive receivers with 1.8m standard fencing.”

This is not including any noise emanating from the non-described but proposed mechanical plant for the lift, air conditioning etc.

- g. Where will the mechanical plant for the child care centre be situated? The car parking plant will be in the basement according to 3.4 EIS page 51. There doesn't appear to be room at the northern side of the property (and would be adjacent to the neighbours' property), the southern side is an exit passage? Will it be located on the 8m roof? The plant cannot be situated at the rear in the playing area. Will it be contained in the car park? Heat extraction and noise issues are?
- h. Exit plan- There is no emergency plan attached to the EIS available on the website. What would the exit plan for the children be? The southern side looks narrow and there is no fence shown leaving a unsafe drop near the driveway.
- i. Environmental impacts- this design will add heat to the street and add stormwater run-off (at least there should be a water tank) as there seems to be an increase in hard surfaces?
- j. Environmental Impacts Statement- errors.
 - (i) The site is not opposite Nemesia Street Park as per the Environmental Impacts Statement on page 8. There is a row of houses between the site and the park.
 - (ii) The photos on page 13 – southwards and northwards view – this is the same photo!
 - (iii) Page 17- refers to direct pedestrian access from Fraser Street-?
 - (iv) Page 54 Safety and Security- refers to Whitworth street and Fraser Street? This is not accurate and this section must be corrected.
 - (v) Page 55 – Waste- refers to “residents” and “location of communal bin storage”
 - (vi) No emergency plan attached available.
 - (vii) Reference to nappy changing facilities and sleeping for 0-2 year olds?

These errors reflect a major question about how robust this DA has been writt

Further this street has previously been identified as flood prone location .This has been identified in the "PROSPECT CREEK OVERLAND FLOOD STUDY". Underground parking would be of real concern .

In summary, this will add extra traffic to a narrow street, add noise that cannot be realistically controlled in a quiet street, on a mid-block location in the middle of a residential street, already bearing the noise from the school and adjoining factories at the bottom of the street. The proposed acoustic recommendations are not realistic and unsatisfactory.

We object to development application No **2018/284/1** and submit the following for consideration by Council:

- 1 We already have significant problems with parking at the top of Hyacinth Street during school times, morning and afternoon and when meetings are on at Widemere School in the evenings as cars are parked on both sides of the street. When leaving the street during these times we go down to Gardenia Parade as the width of Hyacinth Street does not give easy navigation of a vehicle passed the parked cars. Hyacinth Street is too narrow and when vehicles are parked either side of the street, flow through traffic, emergency service vehicles, garbage collection trucks, street cleaning trucks and recycling trucks will not be able to pass safely, if at all. Approval of this development application will only intensify the problems in an already congested street.

People have the attitude "oh I won't be long" and we are sure that parents dropping off children to the child care will probably take this attitude.
- 2 The proposed building streetscape is not in keeping with the existing dwellings in the street.
- 3 It is intended to fence the front boundary – there are no front boundary fences to any existing dwelling in Hyacinth Street. This will alter the streetscape in Hyacinth Street.
- 4 The development application indicates that the vehicles bringing children to the site will be able to egress the building from the basement to the street frontage in a forward manner. The application does not indicate a "turning space" in the basement.

- 5 The proposed acoustic fencing does not comply with Cumberland DCP and as noted in the Landscape Concept diagram, the proposed acoustic fencing extends beyond the rear of the development.
- 6 There is a balcony on the first level which overlooks the dwellings opposite – this is a privacy issue.
- 7 In the winter months when car lights are on, the egress from the basement carpark will mean that the dwellings opposite will be affected by those lights shining into their dwellings.
- 8 We moved to Hyacinth Street over 35 years ago for the reason that it was a quiet street. Since moving in we also found that the neighbours were friendly and helpful and happy to assist, if necessary, at any time. This is still continuing today. If the proposed child care is approved the ambience of the street will change.
- 9 We wish that Hyacinth Street remains a ‘family home’ street, however understand that in the future, the existing dwellings may be demolished and a new dwelling erected, but hopefully these are residences for families, not businesses.
- 10 We hope that Council will take into consideration the objections of the home owners of Hyacinth Street and not give approval to this application.
- 11 This development IS NOT FOR OUR STREET.

Statement of Environmental Effects

With respect to the Statement of Environmental Effects submitted with the DA –

- 12 **Photograph 3** - Shows a view of Nemesia Street park from Nemesia Street. The description “... which is located opposite the subject site on the eastern side of Hyacinth Street.” Is incorrect, in fact my property is diagonally opposite the subject site.
- 13 **Photograph 7** - refers to “viewing southward”. The photo shown is the same for “viewing northward”.
- 14 **Page 17** – incorrect street name in paragraph headed “lift core and internal foyer”.
- 15 **Page 24** – “Child Care Planning Guidelline” – Comment 2nd paragraph “... to be consistent with the evolving two storey-built form character of the subject residential area”. There is no two storey dwellings in Hyacinth Street which have a streetscape the same as or similar to that of the proposed purpose-built child care facility
- 16 **Page 24** Comment 3rd paragraph “The development has been designed to minimize adverse impacts on neighbouring properties in terms of privacy,

acoustic and overshadowing.”. The residents of dwellings at Nos 13 and 17 will be affected by noise, privacy and overshadowing.

The Acoustic Report

17 **C2** (Page 25) 4th paragraph – “. . . noting the site is a corner allotment.” This description is incorrect. The allotment is in fact in the middle of the street.

18 **C6** The current dwellings in Hyacinth Street do not have fences to the frontages.

C9 The current dwellings in Hyacinth Street do not have front fences.

C12 There are no two storey dwelling in Hyacinth Street which have a streetscape the same as or similar to that of the proposed purpose-built child care facility within the subject area.

C15 There are no two storey dwelling in Hyacinth Street which have a streetscape the same as or similar to that of the proposed purpose-built child care facility.

C33 The width of Hyacinth Street has not been properly considered as if there are vehicles parked opposite each other there is insufficient room for safe passing traffic and especially garbage collection and recycling collection trucks.

C35 “Development site is not within a cul-de-sac or narrow lanes or road. Not applicable”

Hyacinth Street is a narrow road. Measuring approximately 15 metres wide.

If there are cars parked on either side of the road, there is insufficient room for safe passing traffic and especially garbage collection and recycling collection trucks.

4.12 Fencing

There are no front fences on any property in Hyacinth Street.

Holroyd DCP Comment

2 Access C.1 “. . .with the proposal providing separate egress and exit ramps to and from the basement area . . .”. Egress and exit have the same meaning.

7 Fencing. “Fencing is to be consistent with the character and style of other developments in the area whilst complying with Council requirements. There are no front fences on any property in Hyacinth Street.

- The acoustics fencing does not comply with the Cumberland DCP in that it is proposed to be 2.1 metres in height and as noted on the Landscape Concept diagram it extends beyond the rear of the development.

If the acoustic fence is more than 2 metres it must be contained within the development site with a 1.8m traditional lapped and capped boundary fence. Any 1.8m in height fence is to terminate 1m behind the front façade.

If the existing fencing is to be demolished the cost of such removal and replacement is to be borne entirely by the developer. (Nos 13 and 17)