

From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: Tuesday, 3 September 2024 3:12 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

03/09/2024

MR Hendrik van Laar
10 Bedford Crescent ST
Collaroy NSW 2097

RE: Mod2024/0445 - 39 Hay Street COLLAROY NSW 2097

Dear Ms. Claire Ryan,

I am a local in the adjoining street to Hay Street. When this piece of development was first flagged by Council, and protests held in person, along with submissions against it proceeding at all I was party to all of them.

What we had at those contiguous properties (37 - 41 Hay Street) were 4 contemporary houses - some single storey and a couple 2 storey. The properties sported lawns, gardens and trees / shrubs and housed families with kids and pets. Everything about them and their usage was in keeping with the AMENITY and ENVIRONMENT of the area. Along comes a greedy, out of the area developer who buys up the 4 adjoining lots - NOT FOR HIS OWN USE, nor to demolish and rebuild more opulent 4 x houses to onsell for profit. His idea is to maximise his take on the deal by building 9 x seniors living quarters, packed as tightly together, with maximum floor space = DOLLARS per Square Metre, flog them off and disappear. We, the local community, can put up with any of the logistical and environmental problems arising from their - INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE AREA - usage. Let me note, while there are several older generation residents living in this area, it most definitely is not an adjunct to Bayview Gardens outhouses.

The developer's original plans were grossly excessive to land use, Council's Guidelines, SEPP regulations etc. and were opposed by Council with Community Support. Protest meetings were held on the verges on 2 occasions I attended, including the one where Land & Environment Court officers attended to hear complaints. With the fight continuing, the developer scaled back his plans significantly but the land use and footprint of the buildings proposed still exceeded Council and SEPP regs. if I understand them correctly. He took those cut back plans to court and won, with the Court approving those plans.

Now he is back at the Pig's Trough, looking to amend those plans to increase his buildings' footprints to the East and West an average of over 2 metres in each direction = CLEARLY TO INCREASE HIS POST SALE PROFITS by increasing his internal floor space area by dozens of Square Metres and TO HELL WITH THE COURT DECISION AND US, the Locals.

My position, and that of my wife, Louise, who also lives at #10 Bedford Crescent, is to hell with the developer. He has a court win. Let him abide by the Court's decision and those plans they approved. NOT AN INCH MORE in any direction.

His passed plans already exceed the permitted Floor to Space Ratio for SEPP standards. His amended plans would increase that to 24% excess over Floor to Space Ratio and grossly exceed SEPP regs. What are Council and State Planning Policies in existence for if they are just to be broken? If the Court's approved plans can be amended to increase the buildings' sizes this time, what is to stop the next attempt at further amendments in height and floor space???? Enough is enough.

Allowing these amendments through will increase the bulk of the development and decrease the ALREADY MINIMAL areas for grass, landscaping and gardens. The roof area will also be significantly increased, meaning more shading,

view encroachment of neighbours and their privacy, impacting the amenity and environment of the area.

In conclusion, my wife and I objected to the development ab initio, and object to any attempt to get an amendment through that will allow an increase to anything that the Court has already granted this greedy, out-of-town developer.

sincerely, Hank van Laar (and Louise van Laar).