



4A, 10 HILLTOP CRESCENT
FAIRLIGHT
NSW 2094
2/12/2018

To the attention of Northern Beaches Development Assessment

Re: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, APPLICATION No. DA2018/1708

Please consider this letter in objection to the proposed development on 195 Sydney Rd, Fairlight. APPLICATION No. DA2018/1708

I have recently been made aware of said proposed development. Firstly, let me say that the lack of official notification and the manner in which this development application has been so surreptitiously done, it disgraceful and shame on you Council for the lack of extensive notification to all impacted residents in the area.

I STRONGLY Object to this proposed development on the following grounds:

1. This huge boarding house is an extreme use of the site, is **completely out of character in Fairlight**, a quiet suburb of mostly young families and retirees. The development would result in a substantial negative impact on adjoining properties and our local community.
2. The proposed units range from 16sqm nett to 21sqm (**a space the size of a normal bedroom**) This space will include a bed, a kitchenette, a sofa, coffee table, dining table and a bathroom! This is bad micro living and is as inhumane as live exports! Small confined spaces, coupled with questionable characters, of the kind who can only afford boarding house living, will be a flash point for confrontation within and around the suburb. Again, for what gain other than the flouting of developer's "rights", greed and zero consideration for the local community.
3. **Traffic problems on Sydney Rd.** Additional traffic on this busy road will be dangerous. Entry to the building is on a blind curve. As it is Sydney road has an issue with no parking and high volumes of traffic. Adding to this is irresponsible and will result in more traffic violations, congestion, and overcrowding – none of which I aim my taxes to have to go to additional R&MS management to resolve them.
4. **Insufficient parking** for the residents and their visitors will result in side streets becoming even more overburdened.
5. **The proposed residents.** Short term leases – 3 months- will attract transient people likely students, casual workers, Low income earners who will not assimilate in the local community nor contribute anything meaningful other than trouble on all fronts. These transient tenants will undoubtedly create a lot of social problems: crime, anti-social behaviour notwithstanding.

The character of Fairlight will change to the detriment of the residents and have a negative impact on the value of surrounding properties. Of which the impact will be greatest for those on adjoining properties, such as ours.

Furthermore, there is a school down the road and many children walk to school or catch the bus to other schools, and this is likely to be a potential risk for them given the nature of these tenants.

6. **The noise.** To escape their tiny living areas, residents will be encouraged to socialize in communal areas: indoor areas which can open up onto the outdoor areas. These areas are also tiny, so the potential for rowdiness and excessive noise is a huge concern. With alcohol curfews, I fear the problems could spill into nearby parks and on pavements. The tenants will be encouraged to use the outdoor communal areas for socialising. So it is not unreasonable to imagine a crowd of up to 126 people having a BBQ and watching a footy game etc, in a small communal area. Hours permitted: 7:30am to 9pm, 7 days a week. The noise and rowdiness will be unbearable for anyone living nearby. Newly planted trees and shrubs will supposedly block out excessive noise – which just goes to show the developers already are foreseeing and issue with noise and public disturbances.

7. **Visitors.** Each resident will be allowed one visitor every day, from 7:30am to 10pm, 7 days a week. At worst this could result in an **additional 126** people being on the premises, ie a total of **252 people!** They would be 'legally' socialising in units, on balconies and in the communal areas. The sheer amount of people will generate a great deal of noise. **One** on-site manager will supposedly control the noise level, rowdiness, non-compliance of the house rules eg. no alcohol, drugs. This is a recipe to strain our limited Police and Emergency services which can be avoided at the outset by **REJECTING this application.**

8. **The Building and Height.** The rear setback of the development (on the border with Tarquin - behind CD Block) **does not comply** with the minimum rear boundary requirement of 8 metres. It is only **6 metres.** This means the building will be **closer** to Tarquin and **higher than it should be.** This has allowed the developer to squeeze in more units. In order to get Council's approval, he suggests placing louvres on the unit windows to ensure privacy for the neighbours. Also, green roofs (plants), a new concept for Australia, will supposedly give the neighbours a pleasant outlook onto this 6 storeys, wall to wall development. I **STRONGLY OPOSE THIS NONCOMPLIANCE.**

9. **Skylights.** In order to provide some natural light into the tiny units, large skylights will be placed on the roofs. However, at night, these will be lit up and emanate a lot of light. Tarquin residents' right for a natural view will be lost.

As per countless other examples across our country, when there are cramped and tight living quarters, followed by low socio-economic communities, the negative impact on society and surrounding communities and livelihoods are severely impacted in a negative manner.

I urge council to REJECT this Application and rather enable a suitable development of a single residential house that is befitting of the Fairlight neighbourhood and will not impact our communities in such a negative manner.

Thank you for your time



G. A. Rudolph