

From:
Sent: Tue, 11 Oct 2022 16:13:33 +1100
To: "City of Wagga Wagga" <Council@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Re application 21/0839. Att Jessica Facey

Good afternoon,

I am writing in relation to the above development application details for the inclusion of storage units. I do not agree that the proposal has addressed any of the concerns highlighted previously and will still have a significant impact on the homes and residents of the community.

I would like to state that at the council meeting you heard residents speak and address their concerns. As members of that council I would like to see that you uphold the original decision to not approve the proposal. The decision that has been made was the correct and just one that impacts the community of uranquinty. The people who are proposing to have these units do not reside in the community and therefore do not have to suffer the consequence of the units I would also like to highlight that not only is it not in line with the residential zoning it will not increase any profit to the remainder of the shops in the village, again going against the zoning of RU5 village.

Please include this and my previous submission against the storage units.

From:
Sent: Tue, 11 Oct 2022 11:16:45 +1100
To: "City of Wagga Wagga" <Council@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: "Facey, Jessica" <Facey.Jessica@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: RE: DA21/0839.01 – 43 Guttler St URANQUINTY – Notification letter
Attachments: Opposition to DA0839 - - second letter.docx

Application No: DA21/0839.01
File No: D/2021/0839

Attn: Jessica Facey

Opposition to the review of determination of Development Application DA21/0839 for self-storage units at 43 Guttler Street URANQUINTY NSW 2652, Lot 11 DP 1267696

Please see letter attached.

Kind Regards,

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Facey, Jessica" <Facey.Jessica@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Date: September 21, 2022 at 10:50:11 AM GMT+10
Subject: DA21/0839.01 – 43 Guttler St URANQUINTY – Notification letter

Good morning

Please find attached notification letter regarding application DA21/0839.01 – 43 Guttler St URANQUINTY

If you have any questions or enquiries, please contact Development Assessment and Building Certification on 1300 292 442 and we will be happy to assist

Kind regards,

Jessica Facey

Development Administration Officer

1300 292 442 | e: Facey.Jessica@wagga.nsw.gov.au

[Wagga Wagga City Council](#) · 243 Baylis Street (PO Box 20) · Wagga Wagga NSW 2650

Committed to a thriving, innovative, connected and inclusive city

Wagga Wagga City Council acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land, the Wiradjuri people, and pays respect to Elders past, present and future and extends our respect to all First Nations Peoples in Wagga Wagga.

We recognise and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs and continuing connection with the land and rivers.

We also recognise the resilience, strength and pride of the Wiradjuri and First Nations communities.

Attention: The information contained in this e-mail message and any attached files are intended only for the use of the individual or entity named. It may contain information which is confidential or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, disclosure or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Wagga Wagga City Council immediately by reply e-mail and delete the original. Think before you print - help save our environment

Application No: DA21/0839.01 File No: D/2021/0839

Attn: Jessica Facey

Opposition to the review of determination of Development Application DA21/0839 for self-storage units at 43 Guttler Street URANQUINTY NSW 2652, Lot 11 DP 1267696

To the General Manager

Determination was made by Wagga Wagga City Council on 8 August 2022 refusing DA21/0839 on the basis the storage premises proposed at 43 Guttler Street is not consistent with the objectives of the RU5 Village zoning as outlined in the Wagga Wagga LEP 2010 and conflicts with the residential amenity of the village as outlined in the Wagga Wagga DCP 2010. We have been advised the developer is seeking a review of this decision.

very clear in our reasons why we do not want this type of development in the location it has been proposed, and the majority of Council agreed with those concerns. While we understand the developers have a right to request a review of Council's decision, there have been no significant changes to the proposal that would warrant a revocation of the determination made by Council.

As we are still in firm opposition of the development of a storage premises at 43 Guttler Street, we would like to provide our own points for consideration alongside the developer's request for a review. They include:

- No significant changes to the development application (DA) or Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE)
- The development is still inconsistent with the RU5 zoning objectives and conflicts with the residential amenity of the surrounding area
- No marketing analysis has been conducted by the developer to determine the communities' appetite for this type of development
- The developer has been potentially misleading in their actions

No significant changes to the SEE

The changes to the SEE are mainly comprised of developer's extensive argument that the storage premises will not have a negative aesthetic impact on the visible look of the surrounding area. The aesthetic similarity of the proposed structure was not brought into question and is not the only consideration Council took into account when making the determination. There has been no significant change to the type of commercial business being constructed nor the type of exposure it will bring upon the surrounding residential area. While the developer has justified in their revised SEE why the Uranquinty communities' concerns are invalid, they have not made any impactful changes that alter socioeconomical effects it will have on the surrounding residential area.

We concede that one meaningful change was addressed by the revised SEE regarding gate access being more appropriately restricted. However, this does not address the multitude of concerns raised which prompted the DA to be refused.

Inconsistent with RU5 zoning objectives and conflict with residential amenity of the village

The developer contests in the revised SEE that a storage premises in the residential area proposed is conducive to the definition of local character defined by the LEP by quoting the policy. However, the

developer is highly selective in their reference of this document and purposefully leaves out the following, which also identifies the local character of a place:

Local character is distinctive, it differentiates one area apart from another. It includes the sense of belonging a person feels to that place, the way people respond to the atmosphere, how it impacts their mood, their emotional response to that place and the stories that come out of peoples' relationship with that place.

Local character contains many different facets. It is important to understand character in a holistic way, which involves examining the relationship with people and the social, environmental and economic factors of place. Global trends across these factors have shaped places over time and will continue to have a significant influence in the future. Local character should guide how to manage a changing urban environment so that any changes are sympathetic to the valued characteristics.

Maintaining the local character of a place is so much more than having a visual and aesthetic that is similar to the surrounding properties. It is about the impact that a development has on a place. The bottom line being that a storage premises invites the public into a place that is currently only residential. It would make the place we live feel unsafe and exposed. Numerous arguments have been put forward by the community as to why we feel that way, and the developer has not provided any solutions to those concerns, only justifications as to why those concerns are invalid. We do not believe this justification on behalf of the developer is accurate, nor does it rectify the concerns raised.

No marketing analysis conducted

Both the original and revised SEEs make statements to the effect that the storage facilities will only be used by the local Uranquinty community.

"We anticipate, however, that the use of the subject development would be limited to residents of Uranquinty. It is a small scale development designed for local use."

"Our analysis of similar developments indicates that the self storage units are used by local people and not by people outside the local area. We can only make the assumption that people seek storage close to home and would not load a vehicle and travel to other centres for self storage purposes."

"The proposal is in the public interest. The proposal will provide an additional service to village residents."

No market analysis or community consultation has been conducted in any form to warrant these statements. In actuality, the community have vocally made it known that there is not a need for a storage facility in the village, as most properties are of adequate size to have storage on site. This prompts a conclusion completely to the contrary, that this type of facility will mainly be used by members of the public that live outside the village of Uranquinty.

The developer has been misleading in their actions

1. The developer of the Fairview Estate subdivision and the proposed storage facility are owned by the SAME interested party under different company names.
2. In the original development application for Fairview Estate (DA17/0036) the developer repeatedly advised the subdivision was for **RESIDENTIAL** use only throughout the application.

Excerpts from DA17/0036:

“Under the provisions of the Wagga Wagga Local Environmental Plan the site is zoned RU5 Village. Subdivisions require consent pursuant to section 2.6 of the WWLEP. **The subdivision is for residential purposes, and a range of residential uses, such as single dwellings** are permitted with consent in the RU5 zone. The objectives of the RU5 zone are as follows: • To provide for a range of land uses, services and facilities that are associated with a rural village. • To protect and maintain the rural village character of the land. **The subdivision will provide land for residential purposes,** will maintain the rural village character of the land, and is therefore considered not inconsistent with the objectives of the zone.”

“[...] it is noted that **the development is a subdivision for residential accommodation** and thus will have negligible impact on the primacy of the Wagga Wagga CBD.”

“The PSI concludes that “this report indicates that the proposed subdivision is **fit for ongoing residential land use** with low risk to human health and/or the environment”. It goes on to state “DM McMahon Pty Ltd consider that there is no requirement for further detailed assessment”. As such, as per SEPP 55, Council can be satisfied that the site is either not contaminated, or if contaminated, is suitable in its contaminated state for the proposed **residential subdivision**.”

6.2 Development in the Villages for items

C1 Refer to village plans for policies on the preferred location of commercial and other non-residential uses (as relevant).

- The developer advised “**Residential development – not applicable**”

C2 Non-residential uses adjoining residential property are to demonstrate that satisfactory measures are included to minimise potential conflicts with residential amenity. This may require additional setbacks, landscaping, site layout and design measure (including signs) or restrictions on hours of operations.

- The developer advised “**Residential development – not applicable.**”

Additional Controls – particular to villages – Uranquinty

C4 New buildings on Olympic Highway/Morgan Street are to have a nil or small setback, and are to follow the vertical rhythm established by the existing building form.

- The developer advised “**This control is considered to relate to the commercial precinct on the Olympic Highway, as opposed to residential subdivisions such as this.**”

C5 Retain the low scale character along Morgan Street using the existing buildings as a guide Pick up elements of the existing built form, with particular reference to ridgelines and the height of verandahs/awnings.

- The developer advised “**This control is considered to relate to the commercial precinct on the Olympic Highway, as opposed to residential subdivisions such as this.**”

Access, transport and traffic

- The developer advised “The provision of **these additional allotments capable of housing a dwelling** is unlikely to result in significant impacts on traffic or the local road network, which has substantial additional capacity to accommodate the additional trips generated.”

Economic Impact in the Locality

- The developer advised “The development will have a minor positive economic impact by **creating additional allotments on which dwellings can be erected.**”

Social Impact in the Locality

- The developer advised “The development will not result in any significant social impacts, however **the provision of additional residential land in an affordable area such as Uranquinty is considered a positive outcome.**”

Noise and Vibration

- The developer advised “Noise in the locality is likely to increase as a result of **residential subdivision** of the land. Such a noise increase is unavoidable **where an intensification of residential uses is desired.**”

Energy Impacts

- The developer advised “The proposed dwelling lots are large and **will enable an energy efficient dwelling** to be constructed on them.”

(c) - The suitability of the site for the development

- The developer advised “**The proposal is for a residential subdivision in a village environment. The subject site is within an area earmarked for such a use. It is therefore considered that the site is entirely suitable for the proposed development.** In addition, there are no known specific site constraints that would render site unsuitable, with flooding matters able to be managed through appropriate measures such as minimum floor level.”
3. No public concerns were raised by the Uranquinty community or otherwise regarding the suitability of the Fairview Estate subdivision (DA17/0036).

There is no statement of intent in the DA17/0036 for the subdivision to commercialise any of the divided lots. Completely to the contrary, it is clearly reiterated that all lots are for residential use. As such, there was no question that the proposed subdivision would protect and maintain the rural village character of the land and no objections were raised by the Uranquinty community.

4. The developer retained one of the subdivided lots of the Fairview Estate subdivision and has misled the Uranquinty community by not disclosing the intended commercialisation of this land.

Only after all other subdivided lots available in Fairview Estate had sold and were in final stages of construction did the developer lodge the DA21/0839 to construct a storage premises within the established residential area they profited in the sale of.

5. We urge the developer to act in good faith

Had the Uranquinty community been advised of the developer’s intent to commercialise part of the Fairview Estate subdivision, upon review of the original development application these concerns could have been appropriately addressed. The current owners that purchased the other lots in the Fairview Estate subdivision would have been given knowledge upon purchase that they would be building their homes in the vicinity of a storage premises and could have made educated decisions on the financial and lifestyle impacts that presents. Additionally, if the developer’s intentions

changed after the sale of the subdivision, they should act in good faith and uphold their own originally intended residential use for this land now that the community they have profited from have made their opposition known.

Conclusion

We are asking that Council uphold the decision made on 8 August 2022 based on the following reasons:

- The proposal is not consistent with the objectives of the RU5 zone, which is about more than just aesthetic continuity
- The proposal has potential major impacts on nearby properties that the developer cannot rectify based on the type of commercial business proposed.
- The developer has been selective in their interpretation of the legislation (WLEP 2010 and WDCP 2010).
- The developer has not attempted any type of community engagement to address the detrimental impact on the surrounding residential community.
- The proposal is NOT in the public interest, as previously displayed by the involvement of the Uranquinty Progress Association, multiple letters of opposition, and the 80+ residential signatures on the petition opposing this development.

For the reasons outlined above, we request that, on review, the determination to refuse DA21/0839 be upheld.

Kind Regards,

From:
Sent: Mon, 10 Oct 2022 19:12:37 +1100
To: "City of Wagga Wagga" <Council@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Cc:
Subject: Submission DA21/0839

Good afternoon

submit another submission regarding the above

DA and how I am AGAINST this appeal.

To start of i want to thank the councillors who showed us support and shared our views and agreed that the units where not the best option. To opposing councillors I urge you to please come out to Guttler street, Uranquinty and to take a look at the area at question to please put yourself in our shoes and ask yourself would you like to live 26 storage units.

The amount of negative comments, feedback and submissions should be clear enough to let you all know that WE as a community do not want storage units in our residential street/village.

The amount of stress this DA has caused was extreme

The appeal has barely changed a thing - opening hours only. No one has came to discuss this, no safety measure in place and no consideration for the neighbours

No discussion about loss of housing price.

And what happens when the owner uses his master key to come and go as he pleases or let's his friends do the same.

We need residential properties which is what the contract of the land stated it would be.

Extremely disappointing that the developer came out and removed the notice sign about the appeal which let other residents have an opportunity to read and let them known information.

This was extremely unfair and sly.

Once again I invite you out to the land and see that if its absolutely essential that these storage units are needed for the community, I beg you to make the entrance and exit via the Olympic highway just like all other commercial building in the village are. This would keep our children, animals and elderly safe in our street.

WE DO NOT CONSENT

Many thanks

From:
Sent: Tue, 27 Sep 2022 13:26:37 +1000
To: "Facey, Jessica" <Facey.Jessica@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Re: DA21/0839.01 – 43 Guttler St URANQUINTY – Notification letter

the construction of 26 Storage units and oppose this on the same basis as formally against previous submission ie fears for increase criminal activity in the area, increased traffic in a residential zone and the safety children who like to rides their bikes and Scooters on the residential road. We believe storage units are more situated to a commercial/industrial area rather than the back of a residential street with many young children.
Kind regards,

From: Facey, Jessica <Facey.Jessica@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, September 21, 2022 10:54:07 AM
Subject: DA21/0839.01 – 43 Guttler St URANQUINTY – Notification letter

Good morning

Please find attached notification letter regarding application DA21/0839.01 – 43 Guttler St URANQUINTY

If you have any questions or enquiries, please contact Development Assessment and Building Certification on 1300 292 442 and we will be happy to assist

Kind regards,

Jessica Facey
Development Administration Officer

1300 292 442 | e: Facey.Jessica@wagga.nsw.gov.au
[Wagga Wagga City Council](#) • 243 Baylis Street (PO Box 20) • Wagga Wagga NSW 2650

Committed to a thriving, innovative, connected and inclusive city

Wagga Wagga City Council acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land, the Wiradjuri people, and pays respect to Elders past, present and future and extends our respect to all First Nations Peoples in Wagga Wagga. We recognise and respect their cultural heritage, beliefs and continuing connection with the land and rivers. We also recognise the resilience, strength and pride of the Wiradjuri and First Nations communities.

Attention: The information contained in this e-mail message and any attached files are intended only for the use of the individual or entity named. It may contain information which is

confidential or the subject of legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, dissemination, disclosure or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Wagga Wagga City Council immediately by reply e-mail and delete the original. Think before you print - help save our environment

From:
Sent: Tue, 27 Sep 2022 13:13:31 +1000
To: "City of Wagga Wagga" <Council@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Objection to proposed DA Uranquinty

Good afternoon,

We would like to list our OBJECTIONS to the proposed DA21/0839 26 storage units:

- It is situated in our opinion, a residential area, not an industrial area.
- It will increase traffic through Guttler street to which we have a lot of young families, children riding bikes and scooters.
- The results published in the study linked is outdated, due to the findings being published in 2009. 13 years out dated! Not relevant or a positive pillar for 26 self contained storage units.
- Environment impact, as all of the houses on the new subdivision had to be built up to reduce the risks of flooding. The storage units will then impact negatively on run off and add to risk of flooding.
- We feel like it may be a conflict of interest as the the applicant is a town planner and might be treated with some bias from Wagga city council.
- In our opinion, people buy in Uranquinty for the access to larger blocks, rear lane access and option to build large sheds, so the need for storage units is lost on Uranquinty residents.
- The unmanned storage units may bring unwanted 'visitors' to the area, increasing crime and putting our homes at a higher risk of break ins, vandalism and or burglary.
- The storage of potential flammable material, will then need to be addressed by the Rural fire brigade here in Uranquinty, who are volunteers and have limited resources as it is. Most of the volunteers are farmers who are often busy with their own

harvests, during the summer, then are called to fires. It's just another potential danger we as a community just don't need.

-It isn't how I want people from out of town to be welcomed into our community, as the storage units will be one of the first things they will see, an eyesore.

-How has it been determined that, 26 self contained storage units is in demand? Has a study been conducted to who will use them and if they aren't used, what may become of them?

Thankyou for taking the time to read though our objection.

We look forward to hearing from you.

From:
Sent: Fri, 23 Sep 2022 11:10:05 +1000
To: "City of Wagga Wagga" <Council@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Fw: DA21/0839.01- submission

Dear Mr Thompson

Please see original submission below, as pre previous, this is not an objection. All previous comments remain relevant.

Regards

Sent: 27 April 2022 04:20
To: council@wagga.nsw.gov.au <council@wagga.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: DA21/0839 - submission

Dear Mr Thomson

RE: Self Storage Units at 43 Guttler Street.

This is not an objection to the proposal. we would like to simply raise some potential issues that we would like addressed as part of any approval.

1. The hours of operation are limited as per the SEE.
2. Security cameras are installed on the premises.
3. Paving levels are such that runoff does not fall onto adjoining properties
4. The storage of contaminated goods is restricted.
5. A management plan is in place that is available to residences with contact details of the owners.

whether screening for security reasons is required is not easy to identify. please could this be reviewed and conditioned if necessary. Please contact if you would like to discuss.

Regards