

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Mary Field [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dear Councillor Bingham,  
Re: DA2024/1562  
5 Lauderdale Ave.,  
Fairlight

I write to you with respect to the proposed development as above. My husband and I live directly opposite this site and are extremely concerned about the consequences of development as proposed. We will make a personal submission to Council about it but wish to alert you to some of our concerns. We are an older couple, as is the case with the majority of the owners in this complex at number 8-10 Lauderdale Ave., so are finding the experience of dealing with this matter quite confronting and challenging. Some aspects I would like to raise are as follows:

1) When we bought here, expecting to spend our latter years in this building, we were very careful to research Council's requirements on any development that may occur at number 5. Height and bulk of this proposal are flagrantly outside these specifications as we understand them.

2) The water view from our apartment, from Fairlight foreshore to Dobroyd Head and Reef Beach will disappear to be replaced by a wall of concrete. As we age we find we spend much more time at home. I believe this serene outlook helps with our mental health and well being which would thus be severely compromised.

3) I am given to understand, from a previous owner, that the house currently at number 5, was accommodation for the housekeeper to one of the original 19th Century villas, possibly Melrose or White End, where 1 Lauderdale Ave is now situated. It was built with the front door facing east toward the original mansion to allow staff easy access. There is little, if any vestige of the history of early Fairlight along the foreshore, past developers having apparently been given carte blanche in previous years

to destroy anything of significance and in some cases replacing lovely original buildings with inappropriate development (1 Lauderdale Ave being an example) Please consider the historical implications of the removal of this charming, original cottage and thus compound the mistakes of the past.

4) We are concerned that despite a long settlement period, the timing of this application for a DA has been submitted to Council to be considered over the Christmas and New Year period, when it may not perhaps, receive the intense scrutiny it deserves.

5) The same developers have also put in a DA to overdevelop 3 Fairlight Crescent again with very similar timing. I note the next Council meeting occurs after the period allowed for submissions.

6) Fairlight Beach is a much loved and heavily frequented local amenity and along with the pool and grassed area, is an Environment Heritage protected area. There is limited area for locals to enjoy the space and I contend developments such as the above will undoubtedly make the space feel even more constrained. Heat build up can be ameliorated by the afternoon north easterly breezes that presently can flow over and around 5 Lauderdale. This would be impeded by such a large development. The bulk of the proposed building would overshadow the area and winter time enjoyment of the northerly sun blocked.

7) My advice from a level 5 accredited arborist is that the Council considers Norfolk Pines critical trees in the Manly area, yet the proposal plans for this and other trees that help alleviate heat build up and provide wildlife refuge, be removed.

I would be grateful for your attention to this matter. The developers maintain that "Council has lost control of planning in the area". As a councillor elected to represent this area I would hope that you will prove that this not the case and that the Manly Local Environment Plan is adhered to strictly.

Yours sincerely

Mary Field  
6/8 Lauderdale Ave  
Fairlight [REDACTED]