
Sent: 13/05/2019 11:56:16 AM
Subject: Online Submission

13/05/2019

MRS Idette Warburton
70 Lauderdale AVE
Fairlight NSW 2094
idette_warburton@yahoo.com.au

RE: DA2019/0342 - 79 A Lauderdale Avenue FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

Submission on behalf of:
John Boulton, Katherine Hadfield, Jason and Idette Warburton
Owners 70 Lauderdale Avenue Fairlight

We are writing to express our objections to the recently lodged DA 2019/0342 for 79a Lauderdale Ave Fairlight. Our concerns are as follows.

1. Building Height

The plans submitted indicate the height of the top floor will exceed the height control of 8.5m by 1.3 times the standard height to a proposed height of 11.3m. In addition to exceeding controls, this will result in a building that is 2 stories above footpath level and not in character with the street scape.

Allowing this development to go ahead will create a dangerous precedent for the southern side of Lauderdale ave and if more developments like this go ahead it will severely impact on the views of the dwellings on the northern side of Lauderdale ave.

Under the current DCP and LEP there is no good reason to allow this precedent to go ahead to what is already a high-density building.

2. FSR

The proposed FSR is 1.1:1 which is more than double the standard FSR of 0.5:1. This represents gross overdevelopment of a block that is already undersize at 264.8sqm (zoned 300sqm per residential dwelling). The proposed dwelling is 2.6 times the zoned residential density. This falls well outside the tolerance of what you would consider a reasonable variance from the control.

3. View loss

It would have been helpful if the applicant had lodged a view analysis for all neighbours affected alongside the application, however, in the absence of this it is clear with the height and design proposed that views from the ground floor of our property will be severely impacted with loss of iconic harbour views and shoreline views.

4. DA plan versions

The DA claims to be a replica of the application which the Land and Environment Court granted approval on 11/12/2018, however upon viewing the plans approved in the Court judgment they are a different iteration to what has been submitted with this DA. The plan iteration in the judgment is L and the issue submitted with the DA is a mixture of different issues, mostly 'I' which predates iteration 'L'. This is very misleading and confusing for anyone wishing to understand what is actually going to be built.

The statement of environment effects refers to iteration 'K', which is even more confusing as

there is no iteration 'K' submitted with this DA.

How can we be reasonably expected to assess the impacts of this DA when the plan versions referred to are not correct.

We sincerely hope that Council act in the best interests of the greater Community in rejecting this DA as it stands.

Kind regards,

Idette Warburton