

---

**From:** anthony fontana  
**Sent:** 14/08/2025 1:51:14 PM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: DA2025/0923 - Letter of Objection

ATTENTION: Alex Keller

Hi,

Please find attached our letter of objection to the above DA

Kind regards

Anthony and Annette Fontana



CEO  
NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL  
725 PITTWATER ROAD  
DEE WHY NSW 2099  
[council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au](mailto:council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au)

RE: APPLICATION # DA2025/0923 Address: 92 North Steyne Manly  
PROPOSED DEMOLITION WORKS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A RESIDENTIAL FLAT BUILDING

## LETTER OF OBJECTION

14 August 2025

Our names are Anthony and Annette Fontana and we are the owners of apartment 4 on the second floor at 91 The Steyne Manly.

We wish to raise the following objections to the above proposed development at our Northern neighbouring block at 92 The Steyne Manly.

1. The bulk, scale and design of the building will greatly reduce our access to sunlight. We purchased this property for our retirement and future health benefits. This proposal robs us of precious sunlight. By reducing the bulk, height and increasing setbacks and having a stepped elevation design from the front set back would assist in sharing solar access.
2. The applicant's solar drawings are misleading and incomplete. Certainly a red flag.
3. The scale and overbearing nature of the proposed building and the proximity to #91 creates a feeling of crowding and claustrophobia for not only #91 but the whole street.
4. The proposal represents a major overdevelopment of such a small site. The height and scale of the building is out of proportion for the site.
5. The proposal is an obvious ambit claim by the developer showing no regard for;
  - a. The streetscape
  - b. The neighbours
  - c. The general community who frequent this very popular Australian iconic beach.
  - d. Council or NSW state design and planning regulations
6. This proposed overdevelopment is not even tempered by the provision of a social benefit since it only accommodates 3 families and not 6 families as is currently the case.
7. The proposal represents a disproportionate impact on the environment, streetscape, communities and neighbours for the benefit of only 3 families.
8. This proposal represents a dangerous precedent in respect of all the points raised in this submission. Council should not legitimise the practice of lodging ambit type proposals such as this which contravene legislation and community expectations.
9. The proposal represents a contravention of all the design principals legislated by Council and the State Government. These standards are set for the mutual benefit of, not only those in the immediate vicinity, but the whole neighbourhood.
10. The proposed non compliant reduced setbacks on the Southern side of 92 The Steyne increase the effects of;
  - Loss of access to natural light and ventilation
  - Loss of privacy
  - Increased noise pollution
  - Loss of views
11. The proposal encourages a sense of self indulgence and entitlement for a privileged few. This type of overdevelopment encourages people to have no regard for their neighbours. Certainly not a legacy we think council wants to own.

It is clear the architect and developer have not given due consideration to the implications of the design on the streetscape or neighbours and, once again, the proposal represents a very obvious ambit claim in total disregard of compliance with local and state planning laws and community expectations.

We remind council of their responsibility and duty to uphold the interests of its ratepayers by ensuring an even playing field. This proposed DA should be refused.

Anthony and Annette Fontana  
4/91 The Steyne Manly NSW 2047