

---

**From:** Geoff Fisher  
**Sent:** 26/10/2023 7:29:42 AM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: DA2023/1289

The SOE states: “proposed development is sympathetic to its context “. This is hardly correct - Figure 8 shows representation - a 5 storey building boundary to boundary swamps the immediate two storied neighbours on either side.

“exceptional design quality with the proposal appropriately responding to its immediate built form and heritage context.” These words from the SOE do not ameliorate the over development of this site.

Exerts from the SOE “compliant with the building height standard as applied to development on steeply sloping sites, compliant with the building envelope controls” and

“non-compliance with the commercial/retail floor space requirement has been acknowledged and appropriately justified”

And yet again

“We have formed the considered opinion that the areas of the building in breach of the 8.5 metre height standard and which remain below the 10 metre concessional height standard are both quantitatively and qualitatively described as minor. In forming this opinion, we note that were it not for the previously disturbed and artificially modified ground levels across the site the majority of the building would sit comfortably below the 8.5 m building height standard”

support our contention that the proposal represents a significant overdevelopment of the site and does not meet the building height requirements.

“The resultant height and scale are commensurate with that of development located along Barrenjoey Road” quoting from the SOE is an exaggeration of the present situation as at present the only significant development is Barrenjoey House - a significantly smaller construction.

“Council can be satisfied that the development is consistent with the desired future character of the Palm Beach Locality.” - yet another quote from the SOE. This sort of development is inconsistent with all similar constructions in Palm Beach and is not line with the desired future character as it represents over development in bulk and scale.

Council should reject this proposal on the grounds that it does not - in the first instance - meet Council height requirements.

Kind regards

Geoff Fisher