

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 15/01/2025 8:24:22 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

15/01/2025

MR RICHARD ANDERSON  
11 / 55-59 The Crescent CRES  
FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

**RE: DA2024/1562 - 5 Lauderdale Avenue FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094**

Dear Assessment Officer

RE: DA2024/1562 - 5 Lauderdale Avenue, Fairlight - Application

I wish to object to the abovementioned development application. My reasons include those found in many of the other objections, in particular:

1. MLEP 2013: The proposal does not comply with MLEP 2013.
2. Bulk and scale: The proposal is almost 80% larger than allowed.
3. Floors: The allowed number of floors is 2, not 4.
4. Height: The allowed height is 8.5 metres (not 13.55 metres).
5. Sloping site: The proposal does not respond to the slope of the site.
6. Overshadowing: The proposal will create extensive overshadowing of public pathways, the foreshore park and neighbours.
7. Privacy: The proposal will impact adversely on the privacy of neighbours more than if it was a compliant dwelling.
8. Trees: The removal of mature and iconic trees leaves no original vegetation on the site depriving birds and wildlife rare natural habitat.
9. Precedent: Allowing anything other than a MLEP 2013-compliant proposal will encourage other non-compliant proposals to the detriment of local neighbourhoods.

I have three other reasons why Council should reject this proposal:

1. Visitors' parking: From the applicant's own expert's report, the proposal does not comply with the required number of visitors' parking spaces - it provides only one when two are required. The justification for this is unconvincing, in my opinion. Anyone who lives in or visits the Manly/Fairlight area knows how parking is a premium, so not meeting visitors' parking obligations is unforgiveable.
2. Community amenity: Using a very basic analogy, if the proposal is for a building that is 80% larger than allowed, surely that means:
  - a. It will take 80% longer to build (which will be extend the traffic disruption and interruption of neighbours' and visitors' amenity);
  - b. It will require 80% more excavation (along with the noise, dust and disruption that this creates);
  - c. There will be 80% more trucks removing excavations, delivering concrete and delivering other building materials; and
  - d. There will be 80% greater damage to local roads and footpaths caused by these trucks and other service vehicles (the repair of which is paid for by Council, but ultimately ratepayers).
3. Community expense: I have referred to one area of additional expense which will flow from

this proposal (see point 2.d. above) but there are others: Council will need to allocate considerable resources to responding fully and fairly to the proposal. It may need to engage its own external experts to counter the applicant's arguments. It needs to consider all of the submissions that it has received, particularly the many objecting to the applicant's brazen attempt to build larger than allowed. All of this costs Council money - ratepayers' money. At a time when ratepayers have been asked to contribute more money to maintain the same level of Council services, wasting money on a developer's desire to maximise its profits at the expense of community, birds and wildlife, heritage, precedent and fairness seems indefensible.

For the reasons set out above, I hope Council acknowledges the flaws of this proposal and rejects it (and anything that may replace it that does not comply with MLEP 2013).

Kind regards  
Richard Anderson  
11/55-59 The Crescent, Fairlight