
Sent: 14/07/2020 4:59:18 PM
Subject: Online Submission

14/07/2020

MR Anthony Solomon
18 Stanton RD
Mosman NSW 2088
avs@coso.com.au

RE: DA2020/0514 - 1 B Bolingbroke Parade FAIRLIGHT NSW 2094

DA 2020/0514

I'm a regular walker along the Spit to Manly pathway and am familiar with the Manly Boatshed and its existence over Crown and Water leases. I share the grave concerns that residents and stakeholders may have about DA 2020/0514 being the 1B Bolingbroke Parade Fairlight Boatshed Development.

I practice as an Architect and in that role, I am regularly tested by developers and property owners on issues regarding achieving maximum entitlement and exclusivity with minimal regard to public amenity, fair and proper outcomes.

The DA as inspected, shows the common hallmarks of many subjective merit nondisclosures. From the outset it is acknowledged this DA is submitted as an "Alteration and Addition" and not as a Designated Development.

From a town planning and architectural perspective, I have the following concerns:

It is clear the new build entitlement is a doubling of the current build facility

The scale and expanding footprint into public water is a significant change from its existing use

There is a gross overdevelopment of existing use provisions compared to what currently exists

The plans and drawings make it difficult to assess the boatshed and new residence gain

There is no site plan or exact overlay of the old and new residence/ boatshed that acknowledges any difference.

There is no reference to the old boatshed and residence being demolished, when it appears this would be unavoidable.

Acknowledgement of the 50% roof plan increase for the Residence has not been properly addressed in the Statement of Environmental Effects

Hiding the new residence entitlement of more bedrooms by a large rumpus room.

No due diligence as to whether the new residence can make available "existing use" entitlements if it is demolished and extended.

3D modelling does not show an exact overlay of current and new use. Any comparison is slightly out of scale to give the visual effect that they are not materially different

Ambit nature of extensive deck entitlement, deck passageway width, availability of extra internal seating entitlement disguised by ingress/egress setoffs, large outdoor seating area with no real defined boundaries, scale of kitchen, ambiguous timing of kiosk hours 5am to 10pm 7 days a week, extensive new 21m pontoon with reach to the extremity of new water entitlement area
In addition, there are arguments regarding the granting of an additional 40 years without public reference, kiosk noise and odour abatement. I do not propose to expand on these other than to acknowledge there is not enough detail in the DA submission to acknowledge due process or correct channels are being followed.

Whilst there is certain aesthetic and amenity appeal, in its current context, with its many ambit and hidden issues, this DA cannot be supported as an Alteration and Amendment.