

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 21/01/2025 3:36:56 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

21/01/2025

MS Lisa McKenzie  
1 / 9 Margaret ST  
Fairlight NSW 2094  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2024/1562 - 5 Lauderdale Avenue FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094**

I wish to provide my full support for the development proposal DA2012/1562 at 5 Lauderdale Avenue, Fairlight for the following reasons:

**Heritage Conservation:** There is no doubt that the Manly to the Spit Scenic Walkway is a popular activity for locals and tourists. As there are already several other buildings along the walkway, larger in both bulk or scale, with some of dubious architectural merit as well, it is unreasonable to single out this proposed property. I believe that most of those enjoying this walk would be far more inclined to be interested in the changing views along the way and therefore spend their time looking at the water, the ferries coming and going, yachts and other watercraft and in this location, the pool and beach.

Perhaps the reason 1200 signatures on a petition could be achieved, is in part as it was promoted on local social media groups, urging people to come and sign at the location set up on public land ie outside the property on the walkway. Comments on social media indicated people were signing as they wanted the house to be saved believing it was or should be heritage listed and questioning why council had not done so. It would be interesting to also know how many of the signatures on the petition were from those who resided outside the area or in fact from elsewhere around the state, country or globe.

**Overshadowing:**

After examining the shadow diagrams provided for the existing and proposed development, it is evident that there will be no impact to the sun exposure on the beach. As they have used the 21st June as the reference date, this provides a worst case scenario the beach experience at any time of the year will not be impacted. These diagrams show that any overshadowing is limited to the grass area above the beach and pool enclosure with shade encroaching no further than the area where the pathway splits, from the main walkway to the pool and amenities access.

As a regular user of the foreshore parkland, beach and pool, you will notice on many occasions during the busy summer months, the shade provided on the grass areas is highly sought after and often utilised in similar numbers to those on the sand. So overshadowing is not necessarily a bad thing. Currently there is little shade in the area on the walkway side of 5 Lauderdale, provided mainly by the small pine tree outside the front fence (as shown in the shadow diagrams). Surely some additional shade will be welcome in the warmer weather.

#### Trees:

I note that there is some concern around the removal of trees from the site, the Arborist report provides clear explanations for each. I note that objections have been made citing the lack of mature canopy trees in the neighbourhood. This is simply not true. Great concern has been mounted around the removal of two Norfolk Pines on the development site. Along the walkway, from the Manly Pavilion to the Boatshed (a five minute walk in either direction from the development site), there are 34 Norfolk Pines! In addition, in two nearby streets, less than a 3 minute walk from the development site, there are an additional 5 Norfolk Pines as street trees. There is also a wide range of advanced native trees along the walkway including numerous Banksias, mature Eucalypts, Melaleucas and Casuarinas, all providing bird and wildlife habitats.

#### Building Height:

Noting the elevation diagrams, from both the North (street level) and South (walkway) views, the proposed development would be marginally higher than 3A/3B duplexes, and the equivalent of a full storey lower than the adjacent unit complex at 7.

#### Density:

Both 7 and 3A/3B are built to the boundaries at street and walkway levels as shown on plans provided. I note that the recently demolished and currently under construction unit development at 17 Fairlight Crescent (located less than 50 metres from 7 Lauderdale), is also being built right to the walkway boundary.

Rear view of 5 Lauderdale shows there is more open space and plantings than 3A/3B or 7 Lauderdale at street level. There will be more green space than either of the adjacent properties, 7 or 3A/3B, at the front of the property (adjacent to the walkway) with the opportunity for more significant and sympathetic plantings. 3A/3B has 2 small frangipanis and low growing plants / shrubs as their main planting while the unit block at 7 has grassed area similar in size to the garden area proposed for the development at 5 Lauderdale.

While MLEP 2013 allows for 3.9 dwellings on this site, at a time when housing density is a major issue for supply, then a proposal for the inclusion of five dwellings is not unrealistic. This would not greatly increase traffic with its location adjacent to a bus stop and cycle path, and a short, level walk to the transport options at Manly Wharf. The current residence on this property has not been lived in for several years, so surely providing five new homes, would be a sensible gain at a time when all council areas in Sydney are supposed to be assisting with housing availability. Some may argue that these units will be luxury homes for the wealthy, however they would most likely be purchased by down-sizers, whose current homes would then be able for younger families to purchase and consequently provide a flow on effect. If there is to be a compromise, then surely given 3.9 is allowable, then a scaled down alternative with four dwellings should be acceptable!

#### Traffic Issues:

In the plans there is clearly a driveway with a 'waiting' area allowing multiple cars to enter and leave the property at the same time without remaining on the road. Therefore there should not be any impediment to traffic flow or cause danger or obstruction to pedestrians or cyclists using the shared footpath.

#### To conclude:

Throughout the Development Application process, I have found that the objections by some

neighbours in particular to be extremely self serving. To encourage others to submit objections providing scripted suggestions in multiple letterbox drops, collecting signatures for a petition outside the site and on public land (without permission) and promoting this through local social media groups, all to ensure your desired outcome is more than disappointing. Surely we can graciously share the wonderful environment we are so fortunate to live in, especially when you have benefitted from exactly the same type of development you are now objecting to ie a knockdown older house replaced with multiple dwellings on a site that offers a magnificent and never to be built out view. Why not enjoy what you have in front of you, rather than worrying what is built beside you?

Lisa McKenzie