
Sent: 11/12/2018 10:44:22 PM
Subject: Online Submission

11/12/2018

MR Agis ZENON
1B / 10 Hilltop CRES
Fairlight NSW 2094
azenon@bigpond.net.au

RE: DA2018/1708 - 197 Sydney Road FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

My wife and I are adding further objections and concerns, as our first submission was made in haste to meet the deadline.

Please note, when we refer to 'Council' it is interchangeable with 'Sydney North Planning Panel' or any Body responsible for the assessment and approval of this DA.

CONCERNS

WE DO NOT THINK THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS AIMED AT THOSE PEOPLE WHO ARE IN NEED OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

The Affordable Rental Housing SEPP introduced Boarding Houses to "provide affordable accommodation to people who wish or need to live in certain areas. They include retirees, students, people with additional needs and people working in key local service industries (nurses, teachers, police officers, firefighters and ambulance officers)".

These people would be LOW TO MEDIUM income earners.

The article below, which appeared recently in a newspaper, clearly states the aims and intentions of the developer: MICRONEST

<https://www.afr.com/real-estate/residential/exfortius-and-schroders-fund-managers-target-coliving-buildto-rent-20181108-h17p3i>

MICRONEST hopes to:

1. Initially deliver over 100 micro apartments catering to YOUNG PROFESSIONALS seeking affordable rental accommodation.
2. Develop and manage co-living and build-to-rent assets with a targeted net return of more than 5 per cent.
3. Create a "defensive, highly diversified and sustainable residential income stream to investors."

CONCERNS

1. The development is clearly targeting young professionals.

"The main entrance will have a concierge, a café for business meetings over a coffee, a place to drop off dry cleaning or meet and greet

people."

This sounds like a trendy, boutique style hotel for yuppies - not a boarding house for struggling low income earners.

Young professionals are more likely to have cars than retirees, students, nurses, etc, yet there would not be adequate parking for them. They will park on the street where lack of parking is already a major problem in Fairlight.

This boarding house is clearly NOT for essential service workers: nurses, teachers, police officers, firefighters and ambulance officers. This housing SHOULD be for them, on long term leases, to live and work in the area, as intended, at a guaranteed, affordable rent. Similar developments in the inner west and Eastern suburbs are currently asking upwards of \$500/week!! This is hardly affordable housing.

2. The development is intended as "a sustainable residential income stream to investors".

This development is an EXTREME use of the site, with several non-compliances. Too many tiny units are CRAMMED onto the site with no regard for the detrimental visual and acoustic impact to the neighbours and the neighbourhood in general. This is obviously done to maximise the number of residents and rents for the investors' benefit. All to the detriment of Fairlight's community.

THE DEVELOPERS ARE TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THIS NEW HOUSING LEGISLATION AS A MEANS TO CREATE INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THEMSELVES RATHER THAN ADDRESS A NEED FOR HOUSING FOR LOW INCOME EARNERS.

Should this development be allowed, instead of solving the problem of unaffordable housing, it will create another major problem by destroying a very good suburb.

3. MICRONEST aims to offer "a high-quality living concept where people will belong and feel connected"

Short term renters -3 months - will not form long lasting friendships, bond or feel connected with their co-dwellers, let alone assimilate with the broader community.

Such a huge development of tiny units in such close proximity, with residents living cheek by jowl, will promote friction rather than friendships.

4. THE PLAN OF MANAGEMENT (PoM)

This outlines the operational management controls. They will be carried out by a Site Manager who is to be contactable 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The House Rules appear to comply with the expected behaviour and conduct of the residents.

However, it is HIGHLY UNLIKELY that these rules will be/can be

effectively enforced. The Site Manager will supposedly manage the entire site: screen new residents, issue lease agreements, continually inspect units for compliance to occupancy numbers, fire regulations, cleanliness etc. He will sign in and out, all visitors. He will monitor all communal areas, indoors and outdoors, for breaches of alcohol, drugs, gambling bans, noise etc. He will check that all residents are ensuring their visitors comply with the House Rules. If not, he will issue letters of warning. He will be available to sort out complaints from neighbours. He will also supervise staff: café workers, cleaners, gardeners. The list goes on and on.

This omnipresent, multi-tasking Site Manager will perform this job single-handedly, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If this is not the case, no mention is made of an alternative plan in the PoM.

In reality, it is unlikely he would even recognise most of the short-term residents, let alone their visitors!

VISITORS: "The 126 residents will be allowed 1 visitor each, between 7.30am and 10pm, 7 days a week.

Residents must sign in their visitors. They must accompany them at all times and ensure they comply with the House Rules."

There could potentially be 126 VISITORS. In the worst-case scenario, together with the residents, there could be 252 PEOPLE, in total, on site. With permission, visitors could even stay for up to 5 days on the premises.

Very strict controls of all visitors would have to be essential to ensure the safety and wellbeing of everyone. A casual attitude by management could result in ANYONE being allowed in; Drunks, drug dealers, hooligans, terrorists, criminals etc. On signing IN: visitors' photo IDs would be needed -copied, checked and kept in the case of serious breaches and unlawful behaviour. Signing OUT: strict checks would need to be made that all visitors have actually left and are not 'crashing for the night' or 'couch surfing'.

In the case normal accommodation in Fairlight e.g. homes and units, visitors do not generally impact on neighbours. Indoor socialising would not be heard and the occasional outdoor barbeques, kids' parties etc have an acceptable noise level and are tolerated, as neighbours are respectful towards one another.

The NOISE created by up to 252 people socialising on such a small site, would have an ENORMOUS, DISASTROUS impact on neighbours.

Visitors would be entitled to visit from 7.30 am -10.00pm, 14 ½ HOURS, so they could virtually live there. They would be allowed access EVERYWHERE: inside units, on balconies, in all communal areas and could use all the facilities: laundries, kitchens, BBQs. The age of most residents would probably range from 18 to 35 years, so it assumed their friends would be that age, too. Normal socialising of this age group involves loud talking, loud laughing, loud music, lots of alcohol and to a certain extent, drug taking.

One only has to walk along the East Esplanade in Manly after 8.30pm to see how law abiding this demographic is, regarding alcohol. There are signs everywhere prohibiting alcohol after 8.30pm. Yet 90% of

people socialising there arrive with bags/ eskies full of alcohol. Police officers/rangers usually patrol the area IN PAIRS OR GROUPS. They firmly remind visitors of the law, but do not confiscate the alcohol. Once their backs are turned, the drinking (and no doubt drug taking) blatantly continues. Should any brawls and violence break out, the police are trained and armed to arrest dangerous offenders. If necessary, they can call for immediate back up from the nearby Manly police station.

In the boarding house scenario, the overcrowding of so many people in very confined accommodation and communal areas will surely result in dangerous, anti-social behaviour.

ONE site manager will supposedly control this crowd of 126 - 252 people!!

Will the Manly Police be the immediate back up? Or will the neighbours be calling 000 on a regular basis?

CONCLUSION

1. This development will not provide long term affordable housing for those needing it: low to medium income earners.

2. It is an opportunistic attempt by the developers to use the Affordable Rental Housing as a means to create a lucrative investment for themselves and their investors.

3. A development of this nature is impossible to manage effectively. It is all very well to have a PoM or rules but these cannot be enforced.

4. Parking and traffic in the area will be a nightmare should this development be approved. The boarding house residents, their visitors, service providers (café workers, gardeners, cleaners, delivery people) will only increase the existing problems on Sydney Road.

5. The developers appear to be using a common 'over reach' tactic with this DA application. They have applied for an unrealistic, outrageous number of units and residents in the hope 'Council' will downscale their application to WHAT THEY ACTUALLY WANT, e.g. instead of 126 residents, they will accept 100. In this way, it will appear as if both 'Council' and the developer have listened to the objectors and have appeased them.

6. This is UNACCEPTABLE.

ANY changes or compromises should be re issued to Fairlight owners for transparency, clarification and further possible objections.

7. We hope this application will be rejected OUTRIGHT. It should not be considered until there has been a DEFINITE and CONCLUSIVE outcome in response to community consultation and concerns: See www.planning.nsw.gov.au/affordablerentalhousingsepp. Reductions and restrictions on the size of Boarding Houses could be

legislated.

This could deliver affordable, quality housing to the intended residents, without negatively impacting the character of established suburbs.