
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 23/11/2021 6:13:05 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

23/11/2021

MS Dianne Parrish
2 / 1 Berry AVE
Fairlight NSW 2094

RE: DA2021/2034 - 30 Fairlight Street FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

Dianne Parrish
Unit 2/1 Berry Avenue
FAIRLIGHT
2094.

22 November 2021
The Executive Manager Development Assessment
NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL
1 Belgrave Street
Manly NSW 2095

Attention: Adam Croft

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 30 FAIRLIGHT STREET, FAIRLIGHT
DA2021/2034 BY 30 FAIRLIGHT STREET PTY LTD

Dear Mr. Croft,

I am the owner of 2/1 Berry Avenue Fairlight, located directly behind the proposed development at 30 Fairlight St. Fairlight. I am enormously concerned about the absolute over development of the site and I wish to object on the following grounds:

- (1) Setbacks - The development is excessively close to the side boundaries and does not follow the setbacks and building separation requirements of SEPP65/ADG and the Manly DCP (which I understand is over-ridden by the former in any case). The result is a severe closing up of the space between 30 Fairlight and the buildings on either side, especially 32 Fairlight. This will impact the views and outlook from my balcony and living rooms and those of my immediate neighbours.
- (2) Streetscape - The setback non compliances are also detrimental to the neighbourhood and streetscape introducing a bulky crowded and dominating form. The proposed bulk and scale of development is Not consistent with the existing and desired streetscape character .
- (3) Height - The proposed building does not comply with the envelope controls contained in Manly DCP Clause 4.1.2.1 External Wall Height and Clause 4.1.2.3 Roof Height. The outer corners of the roof of the top floor project outside the allowable envelope again impacting my views. I note that that this would not be an issue if the setbacks were complied with.
- (4) Excess Height - I notice that the floor to floors of the building, especially the top floor

exceed what is necessary to comfortably achieve 2700 ceiling heights. This is of concern because it demonstrates that the applicant is not considering the amenity of neighbours and making no attempt to view share by exaggerating the height of the building unnecessarily. The floor to floor heights for the 2 lower levels are 3.3 metres, 600mm than the required ceiling height. The top floor has a floor to roof dimension of 3.95 metres which far exceeds what is necessary for a 2700 ceiling. The building could be nearly 1 metre lower with no impacts on the residents but a dramatic improvement on the impact on my amenity and views as well as those of my neighbours.

(5) Excess FSR - The Applicant has not made clear that as well as FSR non-compliance, and in order to squeeze the additional floor space/ unit-size onto the site, compliance with numerous other development controls is not met including:

- Side Setbacks
- External Wall Heights and Roof Height
- Streetscape
- Front Setbacks
- Building Bulk
- Solar Access
- Amenity
- View Sharing

When taken together these non-compliances result in extensive negative impacts on the surrounding neighbours and the community generally when streetscape is considered.

(6) Precedent - I also worry that if such an obviously non-complaint scheme is approved it will set a precedent for approval of a similar development at 32 Fairlight Street in the future. This will only compound all of the adverse impacts inherent in the proposed scheme. View sharing will be further eroded, setbacks between buildings will be woefully non-compliant, inadequate building separation and setbacks will dramatically diminish resident and neighbour privacy and amenity and required access to sunlight will not be achievable.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is very difficult to find/witness any improvements on the previous development application (Mar.2020) that fortunately was withdrawn, presumably a result of the previous objections.

Although we now have 5 units rather than the previous 7 units, they are so large, (in effect a staggering 20% exceedance of the FSR) they have a combined floor area of 740sqm. For comparison this is actually equivalent to 7 off 3 Bedroom units at 106sqm. The 7 off 2020 DA units were proposed at 113sqm each. I reference DA drawings DA600 to DA604 proposed by the applicant for 32 Fairlight Street which are only 96sqm each. This really is an acknowledgement by the Applicant that its own provision of 140sqm apartments, is excessive.

What is equally concerning within the new proposal, albeit with two less units, is that the required 12 metre building separations and 6+ metre side setbacks, especially to 32 Fairlight Street, were totally ignored, inflicting serious negative impacts on my (and my neighbours') amenity. The sheer overall bulk and height exceeds the previous withdrawn DA in height, width and front boundary setback.

It would be appreciated if Council could instruct the Applicant to erect poles at various locations on the site to show the height limits of the proposed structure, as it is currently impossible for

residents in Berry Avenue and neighbouring properties to make an informed assessment.

I present these objections in good faith and trust that the Council will consider that the proposed development has indeed stretched the "boundaries " way too far.....

Kind regards
Dianne Parrish