

SUN VALLEY REAL ESTATE PTY LIMITED

ABN 30 000 521 059

Suite 21, Level 2
19-23 Bridge Street
(PO Box 1105)
PYMBLE NSW 2073
Phn: 9983 1122
Fax: 9983 1400
Email:
parkes.dev@bigpond.com

29 August 2013

RE: SUBMISSION TO THE E3 STRATEGIC REVIEW DRAFT REPORT
OXFORD FALLS VALLEY AND BELROSE NORTH

The review that was undertaken was welcomed and warmly received. Council and Planning and Infrastructure joint co-operation suggested that a fair and reasonable approach was finally being taken to the questions that many residents had felt had not previously been given a clear and unbiased consideration.

Meetings, inspections were held points of view were given the opportunity to be presented and raised with the new partnership. It was suggested that the review would examine and consider the most appropriate zones and land use controls.

The draft Oxford Falls report found "the majority of the area should be zoned E3 because of its environmental values and relatively limited infrastructure". Some smaller areas were identified for alternative zonings or uses. The comments seemed to show that a way forward had been established until you got to the detail.

We have found that the site surveys are inaccurate and inadequate.

The methodology used was not consistent with the translation from LEP 2000 for other properties in the Warringah LGA.

The Environmental Assessment is false and weighted to previous studies which have been proven to be wrong

I am unable to dissect all the properties that were examined by the new partnership as this knowledge would be far too detailed (that was why the inspections were held). However if the site analysis of sites 3 & 4 in precinct F are an example, it is no wonder why the results are so incorrect.

We object to the E3 zone over our land as the basic research is flawed and conclusions drawn are wrong.

The hope for a fair assessment of the E3 zone was unfounded. The examination was just the same old with little change. The following comments are made about site analysis sheets, precinct F, site 4 – id as 72 Cromer Road Cromer.

The word adjoin – has a definition to be next to – Collins English Dictionary

Or next to and joined with – The Australian Concise Oxford Dictionary – the expectation is that an analysis would take into consideration all sides of a property – not a narrow or one sided view

Adjoins an urban area - no

If one side of a four sided property is considered the statement may be correct

Portion of the land adjoins Urban area – Macquarie Street, Fouveaux Place and Northcott Roads. Many people are living on adjoining blocks of land next door to this lot.

Adjoins bushland - yes this is correct if as said above, one side of the property is considered and you exclude the fact that it adjoins a Crown Road – Cromer Valley Road for two thirds of this boundary.

No access to the property

Reference to vegetation was not filled in

Environmental constraints was filled in – if information is available for the later why was the former not filled in – seems odd.

This property has been developed with a substantial home upon it including many adjoining buildings as well as a helipad.

The majority of land on the ridge has been cleared and cultivated. Portion of the site not cleared is located between the Urban edge of residential land and the house – in a smaller block This would be called living space.

Additional comments not filled in. Thus not giving the parties reviewing the analysis after seeing over 150 properties any trigger to recall – not easy to remember such detail for all the inspections of such a unique property

Precinct F Site 3

identified as 70 Cromer Road. This address is not correct. Council and the Land and Property Information do not recognise this reference, similar to site 4. Vegetation reference was not filled in, even though access was gained to the site which is 98% cleared.

In frequently asked questions “E3 Zone is not generally intended for cleared land” - can be transition area

This property is not transition - it is fully fenced with a 2 metre ringlock wire fence with an adjoining boundary site which is a residential home site. The other boundary has over eight homes and a common concrete driveway. This is excluding the other properties that are opposite in Cromer Road. The property is used by people from next door or nearby as a playground and unleashed dog exercise area.

Adjoins urban area is not filled in

Bushland is filled in yes - which the property does on one side - How inaccurate is this comment when you go back and try and remember the site. The property is an odd triangular shape where two to three sides adjoins urban residential homes

Environmental constraints show 95% moderate 5% severe. How could this be when 90% of the site has no constraints. The site 4 (adjoining) has 30% no environmental constraints and it has less cleared land than the total of our site.

Additional comments refers to row of way access - this reference should be applied to site 4, lot 229 has a right of way over it which provides access to 10 residential lots. The property has direct access to Cromer Road of 27.089 metres - the second comment in additional comments states 18 metres frontage to Cromer Road.

The third comment subdivided Foveaux 1969 states when the property was created. The property has not been developed as it is under sized to Warringah's IDO that was brought in a few years later.

As the review covered 176 properties accurate notes would have assisted the analysis not the standard that these two examples showed. Notes about lot 229 are as follows

- created in June 1969 as a result of a subdivision
- in the same ownership since this date, it is approx. 6861m²
- fan in shape with direct access to Cromer Road, fully serviced with water/sewer/gas/power/phone
- residential housing adjoins the complete western and south eastern boundary 240m
- on this boundary there is a concrete right of carriage way for its entire length providing access for 10 lots from Cromer Road
- the western boundary (approx. 97m) also has a concrete driveway adjoining it, providing access to the house on lot 31 located to the west on the ridge line. This property has an approved helicopter use to operate from the home which is in regular use
- the northern boundary (118m approx) adjoins land owned by Cromer Golf Club. Not used by the Golf Club is in a bushland state.
- the property is cleared with a slope to Cromer Road where it is steepest. In the north eastern corner there is a natural water course crossing the land before it joins a drainage structure in Cromer Road. This impacts on the property by about 12m² (.02%) of the total area of the block
- the boundary has been fenced to try to stop casual dumping, unauthorised camping and agricultural pursuits that have occurred on the land. It is presently used as an enclosed dog exercise and children's play area. The fences are slightly damaged. Ongoing access is obtained with a minimum of difficulty for those trying to access it. This is the best compromise for the site. Reducing the amount of dumping and visitations that we get.
- Council continuously incorrectly classifies the land.
- Recently the Biodiversity Conservation study put "very high" conservation ranking over our land. The land has fallen into two assessment units covering an area of 70.28ha. The ranking that the property got was incorrect because of the double counting

The secondary constraints analysis is flawed as well. The scale shows 3 under heritage - this should be 0. Centres has a score of 2. Not aware what this means, however shops are within a walking distance of the property transport - a bus stop is within 400m of the site - why such a score?

Services the block is fully serviced with all urban infrastructure

corridor habitat - the property is fenced completely. No corridor effect - unless you consider bird life and if this was considered every property would have a maximum score

Why is F4 not filled in while F8 which has a residence upon it is filled in - in both cases these properties had no access to the land.

There is a second reference to 70 Cromer Road under F6 why is F3 duplicated with a no filled in F6 reference?

The study is just a duplication of the mistakes and errors that Warringah Council has previously promoted. The Department should take note of the WUFA submission which presents the case for many affected owners and complete a fair assessment of the whole area.

Yours faithfully

SUN VALLEY REAL ESTATE PTY LTD



R.N. RYKO

Director