
Sent: 8/03/2020 9:57:42 PM
Subject: Online Submission

08/03/2020

MS Dianne Parrish
2 / 1 Berry AVE
Fairlight NSW 2094
dpc1000@outlook.com

RE: DA2020/0103 - 30 Fairlight Street FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

Dear Mr. Keller

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 30 FAIRLIGHT STREET, FAIRLIGHT
DA 2020/0103 BY APPLICANT CASTEL 240 PTY LIMITED

I am the owner of 2/1 Berry Avenue, Fairlight which is directly behind the proposed development at 30 Fairlight Street, Fairlight and I wish to object on the following grounds:

1) Statutory Planning Framework

4.1.1 Zoning

The Statement of Environmental Effects claims that "The height and scale of the proposed development is responsive to context, compatible with that of adjoining development and will not result in unacceptable or jarring residential amenity or streetscape impacts."

This does not Comply. The statements are misleading and incorrect. The non-compliances noted in 3.1 Development Description are testament to this.

The proposal is not compatible with the adjoining developments. On one side of the proposed development is a (Circa 1900) Heritage-listed Federation-style single storey cottage. To the other side, there is a tiered apartment block which has a single storey at street front and tiers back to 3 storeys at the rear, and is set back from the property's front boundary line with appropriate front yardage and complementary garden, facing Fairlight Street.

The proposed development scale is oversized, has no set-back, with the lower storey built on the front boundary. The proposal is in direct conflict with Department of City Planning ("DCP") Clauses 3.1.1.1(a) and 4.1.4.1 in this regard. This, combined with the excessive, External Wall Height, FSR, Number of Storeys, Number of Apartments and Front and Side setbacks and Roof Form non conformance means that the loss of residential amenity and streetscape impacts are indeed significant and 'jarring'. Refer to DCP Review for details.

4.1.3 FSR

The Applicant, Castel 240 Pty Ltd, notes that it has breached the LEP FSR limit for the site of 0.75:1 by 33%. It does not Comply.

The Applicant quotes the Objectives of the FSR Control and indicates that a Clause 4.6 request to vary the building height has been lodged at Annexure C.

The Applicant has not made clear that, as well as FSR non-compliance, and in order to squeeze the additional Floor Space onto the site, compliance with the following DCP controls is NOT met:

- (i) External Wall Heights
- (ii) Number of Storeys
- (iii) Density (Number of Apartments)
- (iv) Front Setbacks
- (v) Side Setbacks
- (vi) Roof Form
- (vii) Streetscape Provisions
- (viii) Amenity of neighbours and View Sharing
- (ix) Reasonable Parking Provisions.

In particular, FSR conflicts with the Control Objectives and exceed by:

- (a) proposing a bulk and scale of development that is NOT consistent with the existing and desired streetscape character;
- (b) -
- (c) -
- (d) NOT minimizing adverse environmental impacts on the use or enjoyment of adjoining land and public domain.

VIEWS - Richard Lamb & Associates

I now refer to the Private Domain Visual Catchment notes on page 4 of the above document-excerpt:

"... 1 Berry Avenue... feature(s) roof terraces that potentially overlook the site from the north. The existing views appear to be significantly screened by vegetation in the rear landscape of the subject site, which extends to levels high than the eye height of viewers at 1 Berry Avenue, as a result of which the proposed demolition of the vegetation to make way for the proposed development is likely to result in initially increased availability of view."

What a convoluted description of a view-sharing situation that is totally incorrect for both units 2 and 3. Currently, our views consist of magnificent horizon, lush beautiful trees interspersed with water views considered by most to be a prize view, and totally private.

Should the proposed development be erected, Unit 2 will look straight into a large, white block featuring a brown roof, given the sheer size of the building and its non-compliant proximity to the property boundary. Unit 3 may be lucky to possibly sight something over the top of the block.

(See attached photographs taken directly from unit 2 deck. please note we could not upload them, to be mailed in)

Height Poles should be erected to demonstrate my point.

The fact that 33 trees are to be removed is just appalling- ref-3.3.3-and 11 retained, 5 on development site and 6 on 'neighbouring properties (how very generous) what do those 6 trees have to do with the development site, to rate a mention? Unit 1- ground floor property- with a generous garden style backyard will be overshadowed and loose privacy this apartment connects directly to the full length of the boundary fence of the proposed development. We are extremely concerned about the sheer length and depth of the parking excavation at the northern end, approximately 7 metres below natural ground, which will affect all adjoining

properties. This depth of excavation will clearly conflict with ground water flows, in-turn conflicts with Council Objective No 4 which is aimed at prohibiting this type of development.

Conclusion

In conclusion to all the concerns that I have listed, perhaps the most disturbing of all happened whilst I was meeting a number of local residents, (largely a very broad demographic) from Berry avenue, Woods parade and Fairlight street. Many having enjoyed the best years of their lives in this area, and sadly believe that, yet again, another totally inappropriate building is proposed for their beloved landscape. There was disbelief, sadness and despair by a number of the residents (who had little faith that a fair go would prevail) with whom I exchanged conversation concerning this proposal. The subjection of such a non-complying proposal, in so many aspects, beggars belief from the ratepayers who make up a large percentage of the Fairlight demographic.

I reiterate that the proposal is non-compliant in so many ways and hope that Northern Beaches Council will not make a mockery of the Australian "Fair Go" attitude!

I present these objections in good faith and trust that the Council will consider that the proposed development has indeed stretched the 'boundaries' way too far.....

Yours faithfully,

Dianne Parrish