
Sent: 10/11/2018 7:45:49 PM
Subject: Online Submission

10/11/2018

MS Helen Martin
4 Krui ST
Fairlight NSW 2094
hmartin01@optusnet.com.au

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

Re: DA2018/1708

Dear Assessing Officer,

This DA has only just been brought to my attention. I believe the notice was posted in the Manly Daily the same weekend the Manly Daily was not available in this immediate area. Given the size and scale of this proposal I suggest council might allow a longer time and wider notification area to consider residents' responses to a proposal that, if approved, is going to affect us all.

A 75-room boarding house is inappropriate for this area, is out of keeping with the residential style and history of the area and is completely overdensifying that part of Sydney Road which already faces significant traffic and parking stresses.

If there were a tertiary-studies institution in the area such student boarding might be understandable. But this area is primarily young families and long-term residents appreciative of their quiet residential neighbourhood.

Cramming 75 tiny dwellings with 126 people onto that block will change the nature and amenity of the area.

I also contend the vehicle estimate is unrealistic. I note 38 parking spaces will be provided but Council must know that with 126 people moving in, more than 38 vehicles are going to join them in the area. Because we sit on the edge of residents' parking this area is already highly stressed with commuters parking all day on side roads, dangerously right up to driveways, illegally close to intersections, blocking views when entering and exiting Sydney Road and surrounding roads. That stretch of Sydney Road in particular seems to attract speeding cars. Entering Sydney Rd is already a trust exercise and throwing what is realistically going to be dozens and dozens more cars into the mix will just add to the unwanted and unneeded danger.

Your traffic study on Sydney road only measured waiting times at the intersection of Hill St and Sydney Road for two hours one Tuesday morning and later that afternoon. I don't feel it took into adequate consideration the extra amount of traffic realistically feeding into this already overloaded corridor.

I also object to the design of the overstated and inappropriate development. I have read through the proposal from Micronest and reject the developer's assertion that their solution 'results in an architectural expression that is sympathetic to its natural topography and is expressive of its residential typology from which high quality architecture is derived.' Squeezing

people into these tiny units is not expressing any local residential typology of high quality architecture.

I further quote, "The spaces in between the two built forms will create a network of landscaped places and pathways that will complement the site and create a series of experiences and journeys that will enrich the user experience and enhance a sense of community."

I challenge this rather florid description of what appears as a highly concentrated pile of small boxes crammed onto a hillside with units so small the residents could all hold hands across their balconies to create 'a sense of community.' It in no way complements the site. I fail to see how a high-density collection of boarding rooms creates and enhances a sense of community. I note that after consultation with council the central communal area has been sunk almost a full storey below the adjacent property. The reduction of impact to the adjacent property might be commendable but it is unrealistic to think that such a vastly sunken area might attract residents to come together, to mingle (quietly, in consideration of neighbours), enjoying the lack of sunlight as they escape from their 22sq-m units.

I also note provision for an 'informal cafe space' on Sydney Rd 'activating the street' and it's very unclear to me how this will 'activate' anything.

I also question the developer's claim that materials 'make the entire development appear as a soft and humanised place that comfortably sits in its heavily landscaped context.' In reality this proposed development sits as a highly overconcentrated collection of tiny units - sorry, in their words, 'modules' - out of keeping with the surrounding area's architecture, its sense of history and beachside living and its neighbourhood of predominantly young families and long-term residents happy with the peaceful area.

A large part of the developer's impact-reduction strategy rests on landscaping roof and common areas. Such landscaping relies on regular maintenance to look presentable. But one of these properties on Sydney Rd has been allowed to deteriorate so significantly over the years with smashed windows, torn features, vermin, graffiti and rubbish strewn about. Council might question whether this record of upkeep indicates motivation or ability to maintain this substantially larger development.

The existing property has devalued its immediate area and detracted from the street appeal over the years and my sympathies have gone to their immediate neighbours over the neglect. But this is not an appropriate solution to at last make \$11.3m worth of improvements on this block.

I note a previous application to build three two-storey dwellings with facility for seven cars was successful and I wonder why instead this development allowing 75 units is preferable to that solution for this derelict property.

In summary, the overcrowding, the noise, the extra traffic, the substantial impact of construction, the extra parking and the change in nature and amenity of the area are all unacceptable. Council must appreciate the realistic extent of the impact of such a proposal on this area. I therefore request Council allows extra time for reasonable community consultation and given the alarming scale of this proposal, allows for additional notification in the area.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,
Helen Martin

