
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 21/01/2025 5:15:48 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

21/01/2025

MR Douglas TROOD
1 / 8 - 10 Lauderdale AVE
Fairlight NSW 2094
[REDACTED]

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

I reside at the above address which is directly opposite the proposed development. I wish to object against the proposed DA as I consider it is oversized, bulky and overheight, it will have visual and view loss consequences plus it results in significant tree loss and will result in possible traffic hazards and safety risks to both drivers and pedestrians.

The proposed 5 unit/5 level building does not comply with MLEP 2013 because of its size. The development will be detrimental to the adjacent Environmental Heritage Protection area of the Fairlight Foreshore Park, Pool and Walkway.

The Visual Impact Statements made within the DA are inaccurate and very misleading in relation to my apartment. The visual impact on my apartment is demonstrated via the submission by SP 45435 by Urbaine Design Group which has been submitted and shows the detrimental impact on the views I currently enjoy.

The removal of mature trees on the site which are located on the eastern and western boundaries of the property is extremely regrettable and should be rejected especially the removal of the 18 metre Norfolk Pine, though not a native to the area, is considered historically significant to the area.

The site is located at the busy intersection of Woods Parade and Lauderdale Avenue, adjacent to a busy pedestrian refuge, a no stopping zone and nearby bus stops. The proposed parking arrangements within the development would seem to be inappropriate and should be reconsidered to avoid delays by entering and exiting vehicles.

In summary, in my opinion the proposed development does not appreciate or take in to consideration the critical aspects of the very unique location. It does not have regard for the principles of view sharing and shows a blatant disregard for MLEP 2013. A more complying development should be considered and the current application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully, Douglas Trood