

---

**Sent:** 16/11/2018 8:15:04 AM  
**Subject:** objection to DA2018/1708  
**Attachments:** Objection to DA2018-1708.docx;

Please find attached my submission to DA2018/1708

I pasted this into the web also but the formatting was of course lost

I am attaching the original Word document

Thanks  
~ Michael

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to express my objection to DA2018/1708 for 195 and 197 Sydney Road, Fairlight.

There are many objections I wish to raise but given the short timeframe, I will only highlight the most serious and disturbing concerns below:

1) Parking and vehicle use

I acknowledge the developers are quoting 0.4 parking spots per boarding room as per ARH SEPP, however, I believe in this particular case car parking pressure will exceed estimations. Fairlight has extremely limited on-street parking after 7 pm. I assume the 0.4 ratio could work in the inner city and perhaps the beachfront at Manly, but we all know the residents of proposed Boarding House will have more cars, therefore more parking pressure on the street. Will existing residents need the council to enforce rate-payers-only parking on Sydney Rd and surrounding streets?

**The DA needs to triple the proposed underground car parking spaces to prevent massive parking pressure on existing residents.**

The allocation of one car-share space is commendable but is likely to be in over-demand from the 130 residents. On the downside, that is one existing on-street parking space already gone.

Similarly, the storage for 15 bicycles will most certainly be insufficient. The proposed DA doesn't allow the boarding house residents much in the way of car or bicycle ownership, or public transport – all of these obvious needs will apply pressure to an already pressured neighbourhood.

The logistics of turning into the property needs to be better assessed. Both turning right and left into the property will present challenges to through traffic and boarding house residents.

A huge increase in the area of 130+ people will need to be assessed with regards to road crossing and car traffic at an already busy corner with Brisbane St. This also applies to foot traffic to and from the bus stop.

Generally, the parking and bicycle storage is woefully inadequate and will cause an undue impact on existing property owners and tenants.

2) Scale

I understand State policy is pushing affordable housing, however, this proposal is 8x the size of the recently opened boarding house in Griffith Street, Balgowlah. This proposal on its own would almost double the current rooms available in Manly and Fairlight for boarding houses. It proposes to build double the number of units that exist in the nearby Tarquin unit building but in a vastly smaller footprint. My own townhouse complex (Palm Cove) at 201-207 Sydney Rd lies on a much larger block but houses only

18 townhouses, not 75 units. I think the community needs to be involved before the suburb is changed irrevocably. Developments of this scale are suburb-changing and need to be discussed within the wider community.

The scale is far greater than any existing or proposed Boarding House development and should either be rejected or re-submitted with a 10-20 unit proposal.

### 3) Timescale and Community Involvement

The proposal is far-reaching and has a huge impact on the neighbourhood. Treating this in a similar manner to a resident proposing a pool or a balcony is unfair and unrealistic. Community discussion and education is a necessity.

### 4) Physical building

The large construction has very small setbacks from the boundaries and will create a walled-in effect on neighbours.

This will also detract visually especially from the front/footpath. The development comes right up to the road.

There will be a loss of green space from the two blocks being built with such a high density. A more sympathetic design for the area would see a much higher percentage devoted to green space.

Overall the design is not in keeping with the local area. Predominantly due to its incredible scale but also its imposing nature.

### 5) Public transport

The DA mentions the attractiveness of the location due to public transport. But the following points need to be addressed:

- a. Where is it envisioned the residents will find employment? The local area offers little to no employment. Therefore, tenants will need to travel to and from the area.
- b. Have Sydney Buses been informed of 100 people intending to use peak-hour public transport, due to them not being allocated a parking space? Peak hour services are often full, even though the Bellevue St bus stop is near the beginning of the bus run.

### 6) Alcohol and Cigarettes

The boarding house rules state no alcohol or gambling on the premise. This statement alone brings concerns.

- a. Is this rule being implemented due to past or perceived problems?

- b. Are the people boarding here being treated differently from the general population?
- c. Has any consideration been given to the fact there are no licensed premises in the area – but there is a bottle shop? Are the residents going to drink alcohol in Brisbane St park or Fairlight shops? Or out the front of the block? Or Fairlight beach? Etc....
- d. Or is the rule just there to appease objectors to the DA? And will never be enforced?

The sheer number of proposed tenants would suggest a significant number of smokers, which would affect neighbouring properties. It would also suggest increased litter from smokers such as cigarette butts and plastic wrappers.

For so many people living in a cramped unit, there needs to be a much greater provision of communal space. The proposal has a few token areas but due to lack of sunlight and a likely wind-tunnel effect, these won't be heavily utilised. Instead, boarders will likely use the street frontage or other nearby areas.

#### 7) Employment and Tenant Mix

- a. Fairlight area is a quiet, family area. For us living on the main road, yes, there is a lot of traffic noise. But in general, the suburb is quiet and experiences minimal foot traffic. This development would change this significantly
- b. The current occupants of Fairlight are young families and retired people. The boarding house will not attract a similar demographic to the area and will, therefore, alter the resident mix irrevocably.

#### 8) Rubbish collection and recycling separation

The development proposal is insufficient regarding bins and recycling. Manly council have long prided themselves on being one of the first councils to support recycling.

The provision of only 13 bins to the entire block is farcical. This will obviously lead to recycling material being sent to landfill, street bins being used for household waste, and general litter in the area. Being a "new generation" development, this should include separated waste facilities right from the kitchen to the bin, water recycling, and other modern environmental initiatives.

#### 9) Foot traffic, noise

Although the main road area suffers from street noise, there is little to no "people" noise. The sound of primary school children walking to Manly West Public School is about as noisy as the area gets.

The proposed front of the development incorporates a café / concierge which will disrupt pedestrians walking past. The building faces the north and the boarding house

residents will likely congregate in this café area in the morning sun. There is nowhere near enough space in the design to allow for this to happen harmoniously.

This proposal places 130+ people in the area (mostly walking as they are without a car space) and will no doubt cause stress on residents. Car noise is easily ignored but people talking/arguing/fighting is not so easily ignored.

Despite being an area dominated by units, Fairlight is a very quiet suburb. There are no late-night parties, no people coming home from the pub, no one talking loudly on the street. It's a predominantly family area with the majority of people home and inside early. The boarding house cannot accommodate this behaviour unless the communal space in the building is vastly increased and contained internal to the site, away from the street frontage.

#### 10) Original DA

Many residents were aware of the well-publicised development at 195 Sydney Rd (which is still published on Council and real estate websites). However, this proposal had met with the expectations of residents and was primarily ignored. So, there was much surprise and distress when this new boarding house proposal was aired. This does not show a great deal of respect to existing residents.

#### 11) Construction

During construction there would be even more problems:

- a. Ute parking. There is a proposed Work Zone but this will not accommodate all the expected tradesmen parking. So, they will either park in spots used by residents or park illegally.
- b. Work from home. This area has a larger than average number of people who work from home, myself included. Due to the proposed scale and immense excavation, we will need to pay for rented office space for the lengthy duration of construction, which seems unfair and unnecessary
- c. Truck route. The DA includes a truck route touted as ideal and easy. Knowing the roads involved, this route will be disruptive to Manly residents and unreliable for construction deadlines.

#### 12) Removalists

The sheer number of tenants and 3-month minimal leases will mean an incredible amount of removalist trucks and associated parking and traffic problems. Given a population of 120, and an average tenancy of 12 months (I have assumed people are staying 4 times the minimum tenancy to be conservative), we would expect removalists to be at the site 240 times a year, which is more than every second day. There is already no parking in the area, the proposal ignores removalist trucks – so where would the go?

#### 13) Build and run developers

Community and social housing are an important part of city living. This is neither. The three spaces for disabled parking also point to the development not being designed for people in need. The owners of Micronest are real estate investors, not providers of boarding houses.

This proposal reeks of opportunistic development at the expense of the local community. I have serious concerns about future upkeep of the property, especially given the history of the owner of #197, which has been left in disrepair and near ruins for years.

We have no history to refer to with these developers, so there is a higher than usual chance they will not complete or comply with the proposal. What will Council do if the development cannot be completed? What will we do if the promised “rules” are not complied with?

#### **14) Summary**

- a. Whom do council represent? This will negatively affect the local community and our **property prices, both for sale and for rent. It will also likely put downward pressure on investor yield existing rental properties** given such a large supply of new units.
- b. Opportunistic development with **no regard to our community**. A boarding house doesn't even pay their **fair share of rates**, so garbage collection will likely fall below the standard for other housing.
- c. Not achieving the Affordable Housing policy's stated aims, just developer profit. The aim of the laws for affordable houses are laudable but this particular development achieves none of the aims. It is a cheeky and opportunist attempt at a quick buck and requires such a ridiculous scale to achieve its investor goal of a 6% yield.
- d. An approval of a boarding house of such a massive scale will provide a **precedent** for future developments. This will totally change the feel of the suburb and not in a positive way – people who traditionally provided the Fairlight community character will no longer be in the area. This would be a tragedy
- e. These types of developments may well have their place but not on such a large scale and not just built anywhere. There are already short-term housing options in Manly but to start eroding Fairlight with them is a community-changing decision. The people of Fairlight enjoy the proximity to Manly – but not being in Manly. **This development (especially on such a humungous scale) is not appropriate and must be scaled back or denied.**

Thank you

~ Michael Wardman  
Fairlight