
Sent: 13/03/2020 1:55:51 PM
Subject: Online Submission

13/03/2020

MS Valerie Bowman
5 / 26 - 28 Fairlight ST
Fairlight NSW 2094
valerie.temp09@gmail.com

RE: DA2020/0103 - 30 Fairlight Street FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

Re: DA2020/0103: 30 Fairlight St, Fairlight

I wish to object to the above proposed development on the following grounds.

1) Detrimental effect on streetscape.

The proposed development is for a 5 storey building on a narrow site with no setback from the street at ground level. It is unsympathetic with the local streetscape and is not of a scale in keeping with the area and its well-landscaped local properties. It would appear as a bulky, oversized block, with no garden area, slotted into an inappropriately small space between two low-rise buildings.

It would have a negative impact on the heritage-listed streetscape of Margaret St. The development would exceed the stipulated FSR in a most unconscionable way by cramming seven large units onto a single house allotment. Although some of the older buildings in the area have a similar FSR, they are built on much larger land areas, thus allowing for appropriate landscaping which contributes to the greenspace and general amenity of the area.

2) Loss of amenity, light, sunlight, privacy, outlook and views for adjoining residents.

The proposed building does not comply with required FSR, number of storeys, external wall height, front and side setbacks, number of car spaces and also exceeds the number of apartments allowed for a site of this size. As a consequence it would cause considerable loss of amenity for local and adjoining properties.

Loss of light and sunlight:

The proposed development would more than halve the period of winter sunlight entering my apartment to, at the most, 1 hour per day. It would also completely eliminate any sunlight through the western windows throughout the year.

As our buildings occupy a south-facing slope, dominated by high ridge-line buildings to the north, loss of winter sunlight severely impacts vegetation. The difference between shadows cast by the existing buildings, at least 50 metres away and the proposed development, only 5 meters away is significant.

The clothes drying lines for the seven units of No 26-28 would lose all afternoon and winter sun.

Noise and loss of privacy :

No privacy screens are indicated for the eastern side bedrooms or for the rear balconies of the proposed development. Without these screens northern and western rooms of No 26-28 would have no privacy, nor would the rear garden.

In winter or when there is a southerly wind, the south-facing balconies of the proposed

development would not be pleasant and the rear balconies would become entertaining areas, thus creating the probability of significant noise in an otherwise serene environment.

Loss of outlook and views:

If the development is to be considered further height poles and lines should be installed so that sightlines can be correctly assessed.

Intimate views of vegetation and the accompanying wildlife make an extremely important contribution to the quality of the natural environment. The report states that the removal of trees would improve the views in the short term!

3) Excavation: disturbance of water flow, vibration, dust and retaining walls.

The geotech survey is superficial to say the least. Only four hand- augured holes were attempted. One of these holes only reached a depth of 0.2m and the deepest 0.7m. The report states that further investigation using cored boreholes will be required before finalising the design.

Disturbance of water flow:

After rain surface water flows in large volumes over the property and cascades down the front steps of No30 to the street. Local belief is that there are also significant aquifers flowing through the sandstone strata. The constant waterflow in the gutters of Fairlight St would support this theory.

It is my concern that the retaining walls for the > 6.6m excavation at the rear of the development would interfere with ground water flows and could cause site instability. The northern wall would act as a dam and water trapped behind it would flow south east downhill to No 28. This channeled groundwater could ultimately cause undermining of our building's foundations.

We have gone to very considerable expense to overcome dampness problems, installing sumps and pumps, and would not be able to deal with increased flow.

Vibration:

The geotech report emphasizes the need for correct procedures to be followed during the excavation process because of the variable nature of the sandstone. It also points out that vibrations caused during excavation can damage neighbouring property. Given that the excavation would take place right up to our western boundary, immediately adjacent to our driveway and only 4.2m from our building, rock sawing of the excavation perimeter should be a condition of consent.

Dust:

The majority of the residents of No 26-28 are elderly and one in particular has significant respiratory problems. I ask that adequate dust control measures such as continuous water spray be a condition of consent.

Retaining walls:

Would the eastern and western retaining walls be built wholly within the site?

Because of the depth of excavation, unknown site stability and proximity of our driveway and building, this matter would need serious consideration before any application should be approved. Access via No 26-28 would not be possible as it would involve blocking the only driveway.

4) Environment effects

The contiguous rear gardens of 26 through to 32 Fairlight St make a major contribution to the

natural environment by forming a large greenspace almost unique in the neighbourhood. The destruction of this area, filled with so much flora and fauna, would have an adverse impact on the enjoyment of all of the properties which adjoin or overlook it.

Wildlife:

This area has become habitat to a diverse and changing range of animal species. We observe bandicoots, flying foxes, a bee colony and many birds; including owls, swallows, galahs, kookaburras, butcher birds, magpies, doves, brush turkeys, ravens, lorikeets, pied and black currawongs, pigeons, crested pigeons, sulphur crested cockatoos, koels, bulbuls and native and Indian miner birds.

The proposed development, with only a minimal rear garden, would destroy this space as would the removal of existing mature trees.

Tree removal:

The removal of 33 of the existing 38 trees from the development site is hard to contemplate, particularly the loss of the mature 14m Cedrus deodara, a beautiful specimen and a favourite bird habitat.

I feel that it is an impertinence to skew the numbers of trees to be retained by including 6 from the neighbouring property (No32). The survival of these 6 mature trees would be put at risk by the excavation for the proposed development.

Replacement plantings in the proposed development would be largely limited to shrubs which are able to grow in planter boxes.

In summary, I feel that, because it exceeds developmental guidelines in so many ways and because of its excessive bulk and scale, the proposed development would have a severe detrimental effect on the quality of the local built and natural environment and resident amenity.