
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 8/08/2023 4:43:14 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

08/08/2023

MRS Idette Warburton
- 44a Brighton ST
Freshwater NSW 2096

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

We object to the proposed development DA 2023/0995 52 Brighton St Freshwater for the following reasons.

1. The bulk and scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with the Warringah LEP objectives. It is also out of character for the area, and will negatively impact on the neighbourhood streetscape. Three stories does not comply and is inconsistent with the predominantly one and two story homes in the area.
2. The bulk and scale presents considerable solar and privacy implications for the immediate neighbours. There is no effective privacy screening proposed and the roof top balconies will provide unacceptable noise pollution for the neighbourhood, and remove any privacy the immediate neighbours have.
3. The proposal has non compliant maximum wall heights of 9.2m, that exceed the Warringah LEP control maximum of 7.2m. This is a non compliance of 28,5%. There is no possible justification for such a large variance from the controls.
4. The development does not meet the 'low density, low impact' threshold considerations and is unsuitable for this site. The excessive wall heights and 0.598 FSR (a variance of 20%) clearly demonstrate the large scale nature of this proposal.
5. The development represents an increased flood risk for both the development itself and the surrounding properties. The bulk and scale of it will impact the way water flows from the development into the street and neighbouring properties. This is of particular concern after the experiences in March 2022 where many Brighton St properties were flooded. The mitigation strategies proposed in the stormwater design seem woefully inadequate. The omission of an OSD seems to be particularly negligent given the elderly nature of the future occupants.
6. Approving this development will set a dangerous precedent for the neighbourhood that is not in the public interest for the character of the area and existing streetscape.
7. Adding a further 27 cars into an already busy street would be irresponsible and provide an unacceptable increase in risk to pedestrian safety for the numerous school children who walk these streets on their way to Freshwater Senior Campus and Harbord Public school.
8. The justifications for varying clause 4.6 of the LEP state that it is in the public interest. This can not be substantiated. There is nothing in this development that is in the public interest. Offering seniors high density living in a low density neighbourhood with limited access to services is not in any public interest. If there was genuinely good access to services why would there be a need for 27 parking spaces.