

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 11/08/2023 2:34:18 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: Online Submission

11/08/2023

MRS michelle russell  
- 12 Grover AVE  
Cromer NSW 2099  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2023/0995 - 54 Brighton Street FRESHWATER NSW 2096**

I am the daughter of E Dunphy and 54 Brighton St is my family home since I was born, 39 years ago. My mother purchased the property in the late 70s.

I am sad to see my family home go however pleased that this developer has been able to offer increased housing in Freshwater in the midst of a housing crisis, especially for the elderly.

Alas cities and neighbourhoods are constantly changing and evolving. My mother enjoyed her garden, however with the continuous new structures erected around the property she was unable to screen out the new multiple dwellings. My mother lost a lot of enthusiasm for the Harbord area.

Housing diversity is important, alongside this a mix of housing types and lot sizes increases residential density, however, creates a diverse population and creates a vibrant community. Diversity leads to better outcomes, fosters innovation, empathy, social cohesion, and an inclusive society where everyone has an opportunity to succeed.

Developments such as unit blocks and over 55's developments are not a new thing to the Harbord area.

Wyadra Ave for example has a multitude of units developed in the 1970s. These contain on average 12 lots per Strata Plan. At the end of Brighton St, there is the Commercial shops and residences above, which were developed in the 1960s. Approximately 15 years ago, number 54 Bennett St developed one lot to create seniors housing of 5 units. Then again number 32 Brighton St was developed from one single dwelling to 5 units. All developments without the necessity of visitor parking spaces.

Brighton st has substantial amenities already in place to create successful seniors' accommodation. The side paths are wide, flat and trip free. The street sides have been cut deep and wide to allow wheelchair accessibility. The crossing over Oliver st has pedestrian safety space to cross safely and again is wide enough to allow wheelchair accessibility.

The bus routes are well placed in proximity to the development to aid access to Manly, Chatswood, the City and Warringah Mall via a flat pathway of less than 800m. There are accessible shops of all kinds both at the end of Brighton st and top of Harbord Rd.

The objections received to DA 2023/0995 are consistently from [REDACTED] and subdivisions in the area, with a consistent address numbered with a A, B or C or unit number. Brighton st has evolved and subdivided as time goes on. The last remaining original sites are no. 52 & 54. These reasons are legitimately why a standard and precedent has already been set for developments within the area.

I have reviewed all the complaints, there are approximately three long term residents who have complained (acknowledging some households lodged multiple complaints), one now

being located in Yamba(?)

The relevant complaints that have been raised are.

**FLOODING.** Back in approx. 1995/1996 the backyard near the house flooded from water runoff from the Harbord oval. It went approximately 40cm high at the house only. Since this date the backyard and house has never flooded, even in March 2022 when plenty of Northern Beaches flooded. The water egress has dramatically improved since most of Robert St has developed their properties and fixed their water drainage issues.

The proposed development further improves water run off / flow. Using Robert St as the example, the water run-off has decreased each time a property improves their stormwater systems. This in turn reduces the need for council to step in and spend rate payers' money. One neighbour approximately 150 meter down the street has complained about their property being flooded yet forgot to take into account they directly are opposite/ downhill from Waratah and have huge drains outside their property. These types of properties are consistently affected due to location. 54 Brighton st is not one of those properties.

**TRAFFIC.** The development is for 8 units, with 27 car spaces. This is beyond excellent as it removes traffic congestion from Brighton St, and places all resident cars and their visitors within the development, freeing up space from Brighton st and minimises the hazards the bus must negotiate within Brighton st.

Traffic issues currently exist in Brighton st, due to the number of subdivisions within each lot that do not have enough space for multiple cars, or full garages unable to house a car and adult children residing at home longer due to affordability issues. This is a cycle however and Brighton st has over the years become less crowded then crowded again as adult children come and go.

The traffic congestion and speeding issues could be eased with different options suggested over the years; however, this is an RMS issue and not related to the proposed development.

**NEIGHBOURS BEING AFFECTED.** The neighbours adjacent to 54 Brighton st are all subdivided blocks from back in the 70s and 80s. These properties are sitting on top of each other with very limited outdoor space. They have for many decades had the advantage that my mother had a spacious garden with trees, bees and vegetables.

The neighbours in Robert st mainly are new and as they developed their properties over the past 6-8 years removed a multitude of trees. This has resulted in 54 Brighton St being able to look into the properties. The landscape and topography of the area has already been altered. No. 4 Waratah built a large, long brick wall that faces onto 54 Brighton st, so privacy will be blocked from the proposed Brighton st development due to this wall.

The developer has proposed an extremely generous landscaping plan, with many plants and trees consistent with the current property. The lavishly proposed gardens will contain more vegetation than what 4 houses combined, within area currently have. The set back from the st maintains a highly aesthetic appeal with 13m meters of garden setback approximately prior to entering any lot. This maintains and improves the appearance of the St, which daily sees residential homes removing trees.

A complaint from one resident mentioned a tree that is over 100 years old. This is in fact incorrect. We have images of the garden back in 80s which shows my mother purchased a bare garden with a hills hoist and incinerator. A very 1950s style property. We also had a pool in this exact area, that was later removed.

All backyards on the RHS of the property are dark as my mother enjoyed planting. A large umbrella tree (which I note is potentially impacting the stormwater currently due to its large root system, another reason the development aids stormwater issues) had been deliberately planted to block neighbours that attach to her property.

No bandicoots or wildlife apart from trees exist as both no. 52 & 54 have dogs

[REDACTED]  
The birds will be affected in the short term, however, will return to the beautiful gardens with a large proportion of native plants- necessary for the area.

I read all the complaints received against this DA, a large volume is from the same few households multiple times.

In summary the development is within keeping of the area, meets the SEPP5 guidelines, is consistent with the LEP and offers increased housing in a local government area that is unable to develop efficiently due to lack of land/ space.

Yours Sincerely  
Michelle Russell  
B.Com. L.REA. L.SMA.