

---

**Sent:** 8/07/2020 3:41:34 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

08/07/2020

MS Kate Rowe  
5 / 30 Upper Clifford AVE  
Fairlight NSW 2094  
kater\_travel@yahoo.com.au

**RE: DA2020/0514 - 1 B Bolingbroke Parade FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094**

I wish to formally lodge my objections to this proposal.

I am a long term resident of the Fairlight area and have been engaged for most of my life in the sport of sailing, both on Sydney Harbour and offshore. I was therefore disappointed to see that this DA proposes an increase in the footprint of the Boatshed of over 250%, but with the removal of the traditional marine repair and maintenance facilities, to be replaced with watercraft storage and a large scale food and beverage operation characterised as a kiosk. I note in this regard the Referral Report - Commercial which confirms this change of focus.

The issues I have with the proposal are:-

1.The size of the new decking seems excessive. In particular , the new area to the east will be constructed over what is now natural beach on which the slipways sit. The beach will be concreted. I believe this portion of beach should remain undisturbed. The beach to the west would be a more appropriate launching spot for small craft, as it is more sheltered and removed from overlooking homes.

2.The seating capacity and proposed hours of operation of the kiosk are excessive given the residential character of the area, the proximity to many homes and the stated purpose of servicing existing customers and passing foot traffic. The facility proposed seems to be more than just a kiosk. In reality it seems to have provision for a much larger clientele and be more in the nature of a large café than a kiosk. This will undoubtedly attract many more customers to the site than the previous use and will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of existing park and foreshore users, as well as residents living close.

3.The parking and traffic proposals fail to address the reality that the new uses proposed will intensify the use of the site by attracting a great many more customers over very extended hours. There will be the existing swing mooring customers, existing watercraft storage customers (and perhaps new ones), and the very many customers of the 70 plus seat kiosk. In addition I can see from various submissions in support that the pontoon is to be used to load and discharge passengers and crew, (although it is not clear whether vessels without affiliation to the Boatshed will have that opportunity, and if so the terms to be offered). In my experience passengers and crew most often carry a range of gear which makes it impractical to arrive and leave other than by vehicle. I cannot support the parking solution which is to allow the Boatshed to have 35 public parking permits, given the many older style apartments in the immediate area without parking (one of which I lived in for 4 years with no off street parking) and the existing difficulties obtaining parking on ordinary evenings, on weekends and on holidays. In fact, I was very surprised to find that the Boatshed already has 33 parking permits if so much of the clientele arrives by foot as claimed!

4. I do not support the location of the tender house on the eastern edge of the large eastern deck and directly in front of the homes above, especially as the proposal is for the tender service to run until 10pm, 365 days/year. Surely a less intrusive location can be designed? I would also oppose the tender being tethered and loaded in that location, as the noise generated would be substantial and directly impact homes above until an unreasonable hour.

5. I oppose the illumination of the Boatshed at night, which I assume will happen as the watercraft storage customers will have 24hour/day access. This would intrude upon and disturb the peaceful character of the area and all of North Harbour. It would also disturb the peace of nearby homes during night hours.

I understand the Boatshed is in need of repair and refurbishment, but I do not believe the facility needs to be so substantially expanded in order offer the storage of watercraft and a kiosk, which is by its nature is a small operation. Nor do I believe that the intensification of use of the site should be allowed when there is simply no proper parking or traffic solution available, given the physical constraints of the site.

I oppose this proposal and suggest a more modest conception would be appropriate.

Yours Faithfully

Kate Rowe