
From: Derek Nix
Sent: 19/08/2025 5:05:09 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: TRIMMED: DA 2025/0923 - 92 North Steyne Manly - Objection

My Name is Derek Nix, I am the Chairperson of the Strata Committee for Strata Plan No 100360, 89-90 North Steyne, Manly.

This submission in respect of DA 2025/0923 is made on behalf of the Strata Committee for the Owners of SP100360.

I/We have reviewed the Plans and documentation prepared in making the Development Application No 2025/0923.

I/We have considered the proposal in the context of the streetscape character of the immediate precinct on North Steyne, and the potential impacts on SP100360.

I/we are of the opinion that proposal, in its current form, should not be supported by Council, and I/we hereby lodge our objection to the proposal in its current form.

Our key objections are:

1. The bulk, scale, density and height of the proposed development is excessive and inconsistent with the established streetscape character of the locality and immediate North Steyne precinct.
2. In preparation of the proposal in its current form, the applicant has failed to consider the precinct characteristics, resulting in adverse impacts, in particular the alignment across the precinct of the Floor to Floor RL's. It is inexplicable that a Floor to Floor height differential of 3.5 Metres has been adopted when 3.1 Metres has proven to provide for 2.7 ceiling heights in our adjacent development – Shoreline at 89-90 North Steyne. This device alone is adding unnecessary Bulk and Height. The adoption of the same RL's as adjacent properties would at least align balcony features across all the adjacent properties.
3. Setbacks are non-compliant with the Council Development Control plans. This will lead to unacceptable solar and potential view loss to immediately adjacent properties.
 - a. o INSUFFICIENT SIDE SETBACK: Does not accord with DCP controls; 1/3 Wall Height;
 - b. o INSUFFICIENT FRONT SETBACK: Does not align with each of the neighbouring property setbacks, which has established a key precinct characteristic;
 - c. o INSUFFICIENT REAR SETBACK: Does not align with SEPP setbacks at 6m, which seems to create a significant overpowering of the properties in Whistler St.
4. Solar access – we have recently had solar panels installed on our roof areas to align with the national movement to renewable energy sources and to ameliorate our energy costs. The height and bulk of the proposal is likely to impact the solar access to our power source and therefore impact our feasibility to have installed the panels. No impact analysis has been considered or provided to support the excessive height sought for the proposal.
5. REDUCTION OF UNITS CONTRARY TO SEPP: The application proposes the demolition of the existing 6 dwellings located on the subject site and their replacement

with 3 apartments of varying size. The reduction of Units is not in keeping with the NSW SEPP objectives to increase dwelling numbers.

6. TOTAL OPEN SPACE: non-compliant with DCP controls by providing only 8.8% of the site that is greater than 3m, compared with the control at 45%. This is a result of non-complaint setbacks at ground level.

Thank you for considering our submissions regarding the proposal in its current form.

Regards

Derek Nix

