
From: Nick Farrar
Sent: 6/01/2025 10:12:58 AM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Subject: DA2024/1562 - 5 Lauderdale Ave Fairlight - Submission

Good Morning, I Nicolas Anthony Farrar of 43 Pittwater Road, Manly 2095 write to you now to **Object** to the development proposal for 5 Lauderdale Ave Fairlight. DA 2024/1562.

Clearly Developers are taking Council and community for granted with such clear violations in the submission.

The following points are why I Object as many other in the community have also..

Heritage Conservation & Protection of the Public Domain: The Foreshore, Park & Pool are Environmental Heritage protected areas, and the proposed development will severely impact these areas due to its bulk & scale as well as overshadowing. The Manly Local Environment Plan (2013) is intended to protect this area by restricting the number of storeys to 2 (not 4), limiting the building height to 8.5 metres (not 13.55) and restricting the building size to a ratio of 0.6:1 (not 1:1) resulting is a building that is almost 80% bigger that is allowed.

All of this results in massive oversized building, overshadowing of the Esplanade parklands and creating a huge visual 'wall' right next to the park & pathway, used by thousands of people (local & visitors) each week.

Development on sloping sites: The MLEP 2013 requires that buildings respond to the slope of the site. The proposed building is just a 'very big box', 79% larger than allowed, 59% higher than allowed, with twice as many stories as allowed, and a whole extra dwelling than allowed under the MLEP 2013. A compliant development would present to the foreshore park as two storeys, not the four proposed. It would also result in much less excavation waste, noise & energy use, with a lot less heavy truck traffic on the local roads. Not to mention saving some trees...see below.

Trees: The proposal is to remove all trees on the site. This is required to accommodate the proposed over development, much larger than permitted under the MLEP 2013. There are five trees of interest: two Norfolk Island Pines (one of which is 18 meters high), a Norfolk Island Hibiscus (11 meters high) and two smaller Banksia's (one of which is 7-8 meters high).

Trees on the site contribute to the heritage value associated with the adjoining Esplanade park and their loss will significantly dilute the amenity offered to the local community. The trees to the south of the site have excellent visibility and can be seen from considerable distances, such as Reef Beach and parts of Balgowlah Heights on the opposite side of North Harbour.

Wildlife: There is a significant shortage of mature tree canopy in the neighbourhood. The trees on site provide habitat for local birds & wildlife, both feeding and nesting habitat and so, the willing and regardless removal of the trees on this site is of significant concern.

Driveway & Streetscape: The proposed development incorporates single lift based parking. This will require cars to queue, both while waiting to enter & exit the basement parking. The proposal shows that vehicles will project into the foot/bike path space while waiting, creating a hazard for cyclists and pedestrians on the footpath. There is no additional space for delivery vehicles, which as observation would suggest, will also add to congestion and blockage of the pathway.

The incorporation of 'bin storage' into the eastern end of the 'front fence' facing Lauderdale Ave is unclear as to its purpose. If it is intended to be either a collection or storage point, it is poorly located. During collection, there is potential for this to again present a blockage and a hazard to both pedestrians & cyclists using the shared pathway. This facility is directly adjacent to the pedestrian safe zone 'pelican crossing' across Lauderdale Ave, which is heavily used in peak commuter times, potentially blocking 'safe passage' across the busy Lauderdale Ave.

Future Development: The proposal argues that the council has 'lost control' of planning in the area, and so this oversized and poorly designed proposal should be approved, despite its breach of every measure in the MLEP 2013. The claim is simply untrue. Since the MLEP2013 (and it's predecessor) has been in place, Council has enforced the planning controls explicitly, maintaining a clear and fair outcome for development and the community.

It is true that there are large apartment buildings within the Fairlight Cove precinct, but these are all built prior to the current MLEP2013 and so are considered 'intrusive buildings' in the context of the current code. They are not precedents for future development.

The consequence of allowing this proposed development to be approved is reckless and unfair for the community, and sets a dangerous precedent for future development in Fairlight Cove, of which we know of 2 or 3 'in the wings'.

Kind Regards

Nicolas Farrar
Director

43 Pittwater Road
Manly, NSW 2095

