
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 5/03/2025 7:38:41 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

05/03/2025

MR Craig Pudig
8 / 21 - 25 Clifford AVE
Fairlight NSW 2094
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2024/1835 - 35 Fairlight Street FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

We are writing to object to DA2024/18935.

Our objections are based on the following grounds:

1. Inadequate On-Street Parking and Traffic Congestion

Clifford Avenue is a narrow, no-through road with already very limited on-street parking. It is very different in size and nature from Fairlight Street. Clifford Avenue also has an interesting "design" in that about 100 metres or so from the corner of Woods Parade, the road divides into two sections - the lower end giving access to numbers 9-19 and the upper section giving access to the remaining western Clifford Avenue homes. This division creates an even more narrow street.

Standing at each street's junction with Woods Parade and looking west it is very easy to see the significant differences between the two streets. We strongly urge Council and its staff involved in this application to physically inspect the two streets so that they will have first-hand proof of the significant differences between the two streets. Photographs truly do not portray them.

The proposed development provides only 4 visitor parking spaces for 15 units, which is insufficient and likely to exacerbate existing on-street parking shortages. This inadequacy may lead to increased illegal parking and traffic congestion, adversely affecting the safety and convenience of current residents.

2. Non-Compliance with Height, Floor Space Ratio (FSR), and Density Regulations

The proposal exceeds permissible height and FSR limits by significant margins of over 60% and 85%, respectively. Granting consent to such substantial deviations undermines the integrity of local planning controls designed to ensure appropriate development scale and density.

The number of proposed units (15) exceeds the number permitted by the DCP (just above 9). This again undermines the integrity of local planning controls around scale and density.

3. Insufficient Geotechnical Investigation

The development plans indicate excavation to a depth of approximately 15 meters; however, borehole testing has only been conducted to about 8 meters. This lack of comprehensive geotechnical assessment raises concerns about potential unforeseen issues, such as groundwater intrusion, which could negatively impact the structural integrity of surrounding properties and the local environment.

4. Inadequate Waste Management Provisions

The anticipated addition of 13 bins weekly for the new development poses logistical challenges for waste collection on Clifford Avenue. Given the street's narrowness and existing waste management issues, this increase could obstruct traffic flow and reduce pedestrian safety. Alternative waste collection strategies, such as utilizing Fairlight Street for bin placement, should be considered to mitigate these concerns.

5. Disproportionate Impact on Clifford Avenue Residents

All vehicular access and parking for the proposed development are planned via Clifford Avenue, despite the property spanning between Fairlight Street and Clifford Avenue. This arrangement places an undue burden on Clifford Avenue residents, concentrating traffic and associated disturbances in a manner that is neither fair nor reasonable.

During the demolition, excavation, and constructions phases, large trucks and equipment will be coming in and out of Clifford Avenue with little, if any, ability to turn around. They will most likely have to back into Clifford Avenue impacting residents even further.

6. Health Risks from Airborne Silica Dust

The proposed development will involve extensive excavation and demolition, generating significant amounts of airborne silica dust. This poses a serious health risk, particularly to vulnerable residents. Craig has a serious lung condition, and exposure to silica dust could have severe consequences for his health. Other residents, including children, the elderly, and those with respiratory conditions, may also be affected. Given the well-documented dangers of prolonged exposure to silica dust, we urge the Council to consider the health impacts of this development and require a comprehensive air quality management plan to mitigate risks. If these risks cannot be adequately controlled, the application should be refused.

7. Potential Precedent for Inappropriate Development

Approving this application could set a concerning precedent for future developments that disregard established planning controls and the character of local neighbourhoods. It is essential to maintain stringent adherence to planning regulations to preserve the amenity and integrity of residential areas.

In light of these substantial concerns, we respectfully urge the Council to refuse this application. We trust that the Council will consider the legitimate interests of existing residents and uphold the planning standards that ensure sustainable and appropriate development within our community.

Thank you for considering our objections.

Regards

Karen and Craig Pudig