
Sent: 10/03/2020 11:51:31 AM
Subject: Online Submission

10/03/2020

MRS BARBARA GLOVER
7 / 26 FAIRLIGHT ST
FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094
barbara7a1@gmail.com

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

Mrs B. Glover
"Reef Court" Unit 7, 26-28 Fairlight Street
FAIRLIGHT, NSW 2094
March 9, 2020

Mr Alex Keller
Planner, Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly, NSW 1655

RE: Proposed Development, 30 Fairlight Street, Fairlight, NSW 2094
DA 2020/0103

Dear Mr Keller,

We have enjoyed residing at "Reef Court" for the past 20 years, more particularly when assured the adjoining property (30 Fairlight Street) could not be considered for development as the block (861 sq. m.) wasn't large enough at the time to comply with Council requirements, or anything remotely similar to the above DA 2020/0103.

However, in the event that the owner of their adjoining property, a delightful and immaculate Federation home (circa 1900) agreed to a combined D.A. proposal, then it may be a possible.

The owner of 32 Fairlight Street wasn't interested then, and as of the above date, nothing appears to have changed.

However, a design "Development Potential Proposed Plan" for 32 Fairlight Street included in the Master Set shows a 3-storey front building with a four story block behind, that I believe would be far more acceptable than the 2020/0103 proposal.

In the period that "Reef Court" (circa 1986) and the two high rise properties on it's eastern side were at various intervals permitted, the absolute minimum requirement for projects of their magnitude by Manly Council were a minimum of two residential building blocks.

The proposed development's frontage of 16.1 metres for six, 2-bedroom units of 113 square metres, do not comply with the minimum requirement.

The 3-bedroom apartment that occupies the entire top floor not only doesn't comply re fire resistance cladding, and in my opinion has been deliberately setback to negate the reality of the overall size of the proposed structure, particularly from the street of southern perspective.

Again I feel the proposal's overall height and proximity to the footpath will be oppressive and over bearing.

This proposal will be totally out of character when compared with the professionally designed and more considerate setback of Mondrian, complemented by it's contrasting neighbor Quintella, with it's park-like acre of lawns that together with the manicured shrubs, extend right down and soften their boundary to the Fairlight Street frontage.

In order to squeeze this proposal on a pocket handkerchief-size block, together with total disregard to the distance between door openings and site boundaries beggars belief, as it doesn't comply due to insufficient access in the event of fire.

PAGE 2

As previously noted and subsequently confirmed, DA 2020/0103 does not comply with the Local Environment Plan that requires a maximum floor space ratio of 0.71:1 in this location, due to the developer's request to consider a variation to the SEPP 65 Design Verification.

DRAINAGE

Within the context of the overall proposal, "Reef Court" is situated geographically at the lowest point and subsequently has and always will be the recipient of water and drainage from rear properties, including the proposed site.

Over the years, "Reef Court's" B.C. has rectified the problem with extensive drainage that included pumps, in order to alleviate the problem, obviously at considerable cost to the residents.

The plans for DA 2020/0103 propose to excavate to a depth of nearly 7 metres and for obvious reasons, install the mandatory brick or concrete retaining wall.

However, it would appear that no consideration has been shown on the plan as to how the water and subsequent drainage will be dispersed from the hard surfaces, i.e. the steep driveways of the rear properties, or how it will be controlled.

It would appear that the proposed retaining wall will also double as a dam, and as water always flows to the lowest point, it undoubtedly will exacerbate "Reef Court's" existing problem and create further expense to the body corporate's sinking fund.

A similar property currently exists from the adjoining property, no. 30, more particularly when their rear yard and pool overflows with water. An additional problem from the same property also exists and verbally confirmed, that a considerable amount of water flows under the existing residence, particularly obvious as it discharges onto to Council's footpath.

PARKING - - - COMPARISON

DA 2020/0103 plan for 8 resident parking spaces and two visitors for the 7 units. TOTAL 10. The adjacent property "REEF COURT" also has 7 units and it should be noted that 34 years ago when off street parking wasn't considered as critical as it is now. Council's requirement for "Reef Court" was 4 DOUBLE and 3 SINGLE resident car spaces, then an additional two spaces for visitors, 1 internal and 1 external. TOTAL 13.

That Council deserve to be congratulated for their foresight.

In fact many commuters from the "hills" parked in and around the precinct, to take advantage of a most pleasurable trip by ferry to the city.

It should also be noted that compared to the proposal this may appear generous.

However, parking for tradesmen to "Reef Court" frequently cannot utilize the internal car space due to their vehicle's height, or the external space is occupied by visitors, or a resident's company car. Consequently those tradies are forced to park on the street with the distinct possibility of a fine.

The problem becomes even more exacerbated during summer, particularly in the warm

weather when there's an influx of friends/relatives on those weekends.

SUMMARY: I believe that the above example is typical of many residents in this precinct and the proposed DA 2020/0103 parking allocation is far from adequate.

PAGE 3

ENVIRONMENT AND LOCAL HABITAT

If DA 2020/0103 is approved, we will not only lose the treasured outlook from our rear balcony of the virtual forest of green at the rear of this proposal i.e. the long established palms and assorted flora (photos, page 3) that give immeasurable relief and privacy for all affected residents.

However, most importantly will be the innumerable loss of fauna, including the variety and colour of birdlife and their calls, plus the small flying fox colony, who occasionally take refuge or breed.

How could the desecration of this exquisite and natural domain of wildlife (one of the remaining few in this locality) justify the developer's proposal under Application for Development consent, Modification and Review of Determination 19/20 and not have a devastating impact on the threatened species and natural species that take sanctuary here.

Surely Council's mandate to preserve and encourage the planting of trees is in total contradiction to the planned proposal to remove approximately 30 fully matured trees and flora, then by way of compensation, replace with soft plantings around the already restricted boundaries.

The vast majority of jurisdictions would consider their removal reprehensible.

IN SUMMARY: I believe it would be in the best interest of all concerned that Council require height poles together with string lines to be erected, particularly for residents who may have difficulty envisaging the full impact of the this proposal.

Yours faithfully, Barbara Glover, 99499777

A HARD COPY TO BE POSTED

BELOW ON PAGE 3

A CURRENT PHOTO OF THE REAR YARD OF
30 FAIRLIGHT STREET, FAIRLIGHT
FROM "REEF COURT"

