
Sent: 14/11/2018 10:38:59 AM
Subject: Online Submission

14/11/2018

MR Agis ZENON
1B, 10 Hilltop Crescent Hilltop Crescent ST
Fairlight NSW 2094
azenon@bigpond.net.au

RE: DA2018/1708 - 195 Sydney Road FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

RE: DA 2018/1708 - 195 Sydney Rd FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

Concerns

- 1.Noise. The proposal encourages, due the very small living areas, outdoor activities including large TV screens, music etc. This, together with the number of people involved in the small spaces available, will have an adverse and significant impact on the current noise levels in the area.
- 2.Developer undertakings. The developer has given certain undertakings eg. No alcohol, time restrictions, specific number of people in units, no noise, rowdiness, etc. Is this a wish list or does the Council have the will and the resources to police all these undertakings? Previous experience in the greater area does not give us much confidence in this respect.
- 3.Transient tenants. This development is aimed at people who will rent for 3 months. Short term leases encourage transient people. They will not assimilate into the community, take pride in or care about our neighbourhood. There will be also be constant moving in and out of tenants with utes, removalists etc causing even more traffic problems on Sydney Rd.
- 4.Café: The architectural drawings do not indicate a café. Nevertheless, this café would need to service 120 people and will require regular deliveries, refuse removal, etc, causing further problems in a difficult traffic area.
- 5.Rear setback. The 8-metre setback to rear southern boundary has not been adhered to. A 6-meter setback is proposed. This is imposing on our rights and expectations to have minimum setbacks to our neighbours. We see no valid reason for Council to compromise on this issue to the obvious advantage of the developer and to our detriment.
6. Building height. The height of the building as shown along the southern elevation has an adverse visual impact from Tarquin when viewed from the so called "communal open space" level. This impact has obviously been exacerbated by the reduced setback which has allowed for a taller building.
7. Overlooking issues. No surface RLs are indicated on the "communal open space" of Tarquin (10 Hilltop Crescent), thus the architectural sections and elevations showing the relative heights and visual impacts are schematic only and may be misleading. We would have expected that a series of actual RLs to have been used to give an accurate and realistic representation.
8. Skylights: There will be many large skylights on roofs of the development. At night, light emanating from the sky lights will be visible to the majority of occupants of the neighbouring property - Tarquin. This is in contrast to the current pleasant district views we have. One only has to observe how much light even the small skylights at Palm Grove emanate at night, let alone the multiple huge skylights proposed.

Further to the above, I have concerns that the reviewed the geotechnical report which was prepared to support the DA. does not provide sufficient recommendations to ensure the

protection of the neighbouring properties. I am a geotechnical engineer with over 40 years' experience and am currently a principal consultant with one of the larger geotechnical consulting practices in Sydney. I have reviewed the report in my personal capacity and the following are my comments and concerns:

- The report is totally inadequate for the reported 12m deep excavation into bedrock. The boreholes and DCP tests carried out add little information to the knowledge of subsurface conditions. I appreciate that the lack of access dictated the above investigation techniques. However, in my opinion the report should have been referred to as a 'preliminary report' and should have included a recommendation for rig drilled boreholes following demolition. An additional comprehensive geotechnical investigation with boreholes core drilled to depths at least 2m below bulk excavation level is required. The current report must then be updated, as appropriate.

- There is a recommendation to limit ground vibrations during rock excavation to 10mm/sec. This is contrary to the Australian Standard which recommends 8mm/sec based on the British Standard for brick residences. This vibration limit has a 95% confidence level that vibration damage will not occur. In Sydney the German DIN standard is often adopted which recommends a vibration limit of 5mm/sec with a 100% confidence level that damage will not occur. The lower vibration limit of 5mm/sec should be imposed along the western and eastern site boundaries.

- It is inconceivable that this level of rock excavation can be carried out with no vibration monitoring. The level of rock vibration which occurs during excavation depends on many factors to the extent that it cannot be estimated from past experience. In my opinion ground vibration monitoring to an approved monitoring plan which includes contingencies, is essential and is the only way ground vibrations can be controlled.

- The sandstone indicated in the photographs is described as "massive". This description is not correct and gives a false sense of security. There is a clearly visible joint set which is sub parallel to the cut face (ie striking roughly north-south). This will affect the stability of the proposed west and east facing cut face. As joints are typically orthogonal, there will be a joint set striking east-west which will affect the stability of the proposed north facing cut face. The "possible cliff stabilisation blocks" are also a sign that the rock is not massive. This cut face/cliff to the west provides a 'preview' of the rock conditions which will be encountered in the proposed excavation but was not fully taken advantage of. The updated report must include all of the relevant information which can be obtained.

- The southern extent of the cut face along the western boundary of the proposed development returns towards the west and continues in a westerly direction (where it is often much higher) at the rear of several of the properties fronting Sydney Road. The report has not identified this as a potential safety/stability hazard when subject to ground vibrations during excavation. This issue needs to be fully investigated and appropriate recommendations made.

- The report recommends that the rock excavation be observed progressively by an experienced engineering geologist or geotechnical engineer. The required observation intervals are not specified. I consider this to be most important as the excavation contractor on site will seek to minimise the number of inspections required. As a minimum, I specify 1.5m depth intervals along a maximum 20m length of excavation.

- There is a recommendation in the report that an allowance should be made for the installation of rock dowels and rock bolts to stabilise potentially problematic cut rock faces. No mention however, has been made of potential trespassing issues and the need to avoid installation of inclusions which extend into the neighbouring properties.

I realise that my comments are of a somewhat technical nature and I am prepared to further clarify the issues raised, if required.

