
Sent: 4/02/2021 7:30:03 AM
Subject: DA 2020/1489 Oaklands

Regarding DA 2020/1489

I have learned the historic home Oaklands in Warriewood will be demolished, despite a court ordering this property to be restored.

I vehemently object to this application.

There are so few homes in the area worthy of historic merit.

In the years I have lived in Warriewood, I have seen much of the character of the area razed and its spacious rural aspects replaced by tight urban jungle. Until about a year ago I had a horse paddock at the bottom of my street, this is now an aged care facility surrounded by medium density new builds.

The developers of this unique historic property must be held accountable to the original court order to restore the property. How can it be legal to get away with their obligation by letting it fall apart as an excuse?

That it will cost too much because the property was allowed to deteriorate is not a valid argument for demolition. The developers are responsible for the costs involved; it was their decision to avoid securing the property and to not insure it against vandalism. They will profit greatly from developing the site so they will clearly have ample funds. Or did the court order include a clause that determined the property was to be restored only if they can be bothered to maintain it?

If it's too expensive to restore now, they only have themselves to blame for not securing it. They could easily have had a tenant in the property for the duration.

What kind of legal precedent does it set when a developer can get away with breaching a court order simply by being lazy and negligent?

Or is this to become a means for developers to get out of their legal obligations? The council has a duty of care to ensure developers meet their court-ordered obligations.

Regards,
Fiona Doig
Warriewood resident

Fiona Doig

23A Hill Street Warriewood
Sydney NSW 2102 Australia
Mobile 0438 232 491

www.naturewriter.com.au