
Sent: 20/12/2022 5:15:16 PM
Subject: Fwd: DA 2022/1910

To the Chief Executive Officer
Northern beaches council.

Dear Sir,

RE; Objections to DA 2022/1910 - 61 North Steyne Manly

We refer to the above development application currently with council. Our strata building has submitted a detailed Objection through the Strata consultants Colco Consulting Pty Ltd and this is now included on the council DA Tracker web site. As long-time residents of 59-60 North Steyne Manly, we would like to also submit our objection from a personal point of view.

Our family has connections with 59-60 North Steyne back to the 1930s. When the owner and residents of No. 59-60 North Steyne realised some time ago that it was necessary to redevelop the site, and architect was engaged who was known to us to present a plan that would provide a "new-for old" as all the occupants wanted to stay on the site - many of whom had owned their properties for years some back into the 1930s.

We were all adamant that council requirements be adhered to. At this time there was a planning objective to create interesting roof designs rather than the conventional "flat" roofs everywhere. An incentive allowed the elevated roof space if set back from the side boundaries to be occupied as "rooms in the roof" connected with the apartment below. This resulted in the current building where each of the three top apartments are two-storey with bedroom suites in the "roof space". Again, we note that a requirement was that these areas be set back from the side boundaries. We also wanted to keep a "backyard" element and included a pool at the rear of the building.

We are amazed at the blatant misuse and non-compliance with the planning controls a

nd planning objectives with this development application DA 2022/1910. Almost a total disregard to the controls and planning objectives.

Although we realised that there was a potential for the adjoining property to be redeveloped, not for an instant did we expect that any DA would so disregard the planning controls. Always we were aware of the planning controls and expected that they would be complied with and would with sympathetic considerations to neighbours, amenity issues, the locality and the constraints of the small site. The developer clearly has had little regard to the planning controls and objectives, little regard for the public, the locality, to traffic.

Losing any view is always a concern, however we do realise that not all views can be

protected, and this is generally accepted provided that a DA proposal is compliant, is understanding of the planning controls and their purpose, and reasonable in its overall design approach. **This DA is not.** In addition to the above, there are safety issues in the rear lane and the narrow one-way side street (Denison Street) - and of course, the proposed two-level basement carpark which is only accessible through a single car lift. As the owner/residents of Apartment No. 11 (part of the family since 1930) - top front corner, we are significantly affected especially with overlooking, privacy, noise and also loss of views.

The photo montage submitted presents a distorted impression of our building where it appears that our apartment has walls to the boundary. When in fact it is all open balconies with glass doors and greenery along the side. The proposed top floor in particular is definitely not a "room in the roof" and is a whole self-contained apartment with an open area looking directly onto our open terrace and into our bedroom, and so close we would expect to be able to hear the occupants converse. There are numerous other issues which our consultant has outlined.

We sincerely hope that that the council will insist on compliance with current planning controls and planning objectives, and that this application is refused. We accept that the site will be redeveloped at some stage but it should comply with the planning controls and protect the amenity and privacy from our apartment and others.

Yours faithfully,

Beverley and Bill Murray