
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 12/01/2025 7:32:17 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Objection Submission DA 2024/1562-5 Lauderdale Avenue, Fairlight

From Robert and Michelle Montgomery,
Lauderdale Avenue, Fairlight, 2094

Dear Council,

We write to object to this DA.

Publicly owned recreation areas like the Harbourside Reserve and Fairlight Beach are of particular significance. Not surprisingly people who live in other suburbs have bothered to lodge written objections to the proposed development. It unarguably will detrimentally affect the public amenity. The shadow diagrams show that in mid-Winter, the public reserve will be deprived of Sun until 3pm. Reference, for justification, to home unit blocks of 50 to 70 years vintage, is hardly meritorious. It was that error of development which caused Manly Council to write the first planning schemes and development restrictions. That the unit blocks numbers 1 and 7 Lauderdale already shade much of the public space is not rationally a factor supporting the proposal; but rather, a strong reason and justification for height restriction in the local planning scheme in order to preserve the space which does get Sun. The proposal is for 4 storeys when the restriction for the site is 2 storeys.

The developer purchased 5 Lauderdale knowing what the development restrictions were and, from that, the commercial development opportunity.

The proposal offends every major Local Planning and Development Objective. Those Rules define the Community required balance between protection of the natural environmental public amenity, on the one hand and commercial (urban) exploitation on the other. In this way, and in reality, the proposal offends the Local Government planned character and amenity of this precious public space.

The future will not provide a new or other Fairlight Beach public reserve. Council must preserve the amenity of it (including Winter Sun) against "death by a thousand cuts" of repeated DAs exceeding the development restrictions.

The proposal does grossly exceed Height, Bulk and Density planning restrictions, whilst claiming reference to surrounding unit blocks constructed in the different error of 50 plus years ago before there was the presently recognised need for Development and Planning restrictions to protect and preserve the character and amenity of the location. That reasoning for justification should be rejected In relation to each of those proposed breaches, for the reason stated above in relation to Height and overshadowing, Public recreational areas by the harbourside are obviously rarer and therefore more precious now.

Thank you for considering our submission.

Michelle and Robert Montgomery