
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 4/03/2025 2:38:57 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

04/03/2025

MR Dean Eislers
13 Woods ST
Fairlight NSW 2094
[REDACTED]

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

I strongly object to the proposed development for the numerous reasons summarised below:
PLANNING CONTROLS.

I object on the basis that it does not comply with the required planning controls.

The planning controls are not 'optional' - they are there for many good reasons and have been well thought out by professionals.

Yes, the controls may need to be nuanced to reflect the individual sites, but the submission places a wholesale disregard for the allowable number of units, the floor space ratio and height limits (the blanket diagram, Figure 17 of the Statement of Environmental Effects report appears quite misleading).

It shows a complete lack of respect for the community.

The community has a right to expect that the planning controls will generally be followed - people make arguably the largest purchase decisions of their life when buying a new home, and reviewing the controls to understand what is/isn't allowed forms part of most peoples due diligence. To then not enforce compliance is completely unfair to the community. In addition, allowing wholesale disregard just sets yet another precedent for the next developer to come along and continue to 'push the envelope' resulting in continued degradation over time. All so they can make more money.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The waste management plan makes one reference to sandstone. It states (section 5.3) that "If sandstone is found to be present, this may be sold or incorporated in the building design".

This is laughable given the level of excavation being proposed much of which will be sandstone.

There is no cognoscence of the projects own geotechnical report which makes the level of sandstone to be excavated clear. This element is completely lacking.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The traffic management plan section 4.2 indicates 20m long "Truck and Dog" trucks reversing into Clifford St up to 18 times a day for a period of 16+16=32 weeks. Yet the report in section 4.4 "Demolition Stage" makes zero reference to the impact on Woods Parade. How does a 20m truck reverse into Clifford Ave 20 x times a day without a passing mention of the street that it is going to block? The dwg on PDF pages 32 & 34 shows construction signs mounted directly outside of our home at 13 Woods Parade. There is nothing on the legend to confirm what a "T1-5" sign is, nor any clear reason why a "Road Work" sign is being setup.

Section 5.1 has a letter drop to only 8 surrounding properties despite all the swept paths and traffic management diagrams impacting many more properties including signage/control outside our property and others on Woods Parade. This is completely inadequate.

It appears that the "Hop Skip Jump" stops on Fairlight St are being impacted.

There doesn't appear to be any discussion or acknowledgement of the high level of foot traffic up/down Woods Parade from people visiting Fairlight Beach and surrounds. Much of this traffic is families with small children/prams. This must be managed safely and fairly.

SILICA DUST

I note that the NSW Government has just setup a silica dust taskforce with respect to sandstone excavation. Whilst this is focused on tunnels, it is the same issue - excavation of sandstone emanates silica dust, a known harmful substance.

Given the level of excavation, how will the development monitor dust levels and in particular silica dust levels to ensure all the local residents including the elderly and young children are safe? Regardless of the amount of excavation, will monitoring devices be installed at all of the surrounding properties? It is inadequate to only install monitoring at the property due to the windborne nature. Refer complaints regarding the sandstone excavation and continual dust emanation issues at 6 Clifford Ave.

ACOUSTIC REPORT

The Acoustic Report does not consider construction/demolition noise at all even though there is circa 8 months of proposed demolition and subsequent construction?

It does not make it clear within the Acoustic report whether the loud construction work for the adjacent development at 6 Clifford Ave was being conducted during the time of the survey so the baseline levels measured could easily be elevated.

The Acoustic Report does not provide any detail for acoustic measures for mechanical plant/systems that will be required (Section 4.1) as the details were 'not available'. This is completely inadequate as acoustic measures will likely affect rooftop plant and/or acoustic louvres that may be required. The Statement of Environmental Effects report, section 4.2.11 erroneously references the Acoustic Report as addressing mechanical noise to surrounding properties.

DILAPIDATION

Regardless of the level of excavation into the hard sandstone, what level of dilapidation studies will be completed (at the Developers expense) for the surrounding residents, and what guarantees will be provided for rectification should the properties be affected?

In summary, my family and I strongly object.

Kind Regards,
Dean