
Sent: 1/08/2019 2:15:56 PM
Subject: Online Submission

01/08/2019

MR William Sadler
8 Montpelier Place - 8 Montpelier PL
Manly, NSW NSW 2095
wgsadler2@bigpond.com

RE: DA2019/0683 - 35 Reddall Street MANLY NSW 2095

Will Sadler
` 8 Montpelier Place
Manly NSW 2095
1 August 2019
Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655

Re- DA2019/0683 - 95 Bower St, 29, 31 & 35 Reddall St, Manly

Dear Sir or Madam,

We are most concerned about this proposal.

There many issues, however our principal concerns are;

- 1) FSR,
- 2) View sharing
- 3) Deceptive statements by the proponent's consultants.

1) FSR

The proponent's consultant "CITY PLAN" are lobbying the Council to breach the 0.6:1 FSR by 65%. They propose a development FSR of almost 1:1. This is unacceptable and the existing standard of 0.6:1 must be imposed.

CITY PLAN quote a precedent by Chief Justice Preston. We are not lawyers, and we are not paying to have a legal review.

We assume the Council has had advice on this case law on previous DA's? If so, is the Council able to make that available to us?

Preston states that a DA that exceeds the zoning FSR MUST be in the PUBLIC INTEREST.

The proposed 1:1 FSR is NOT in the PUBLIC INTEREST as;

- We are not aware of a single neighbour who is in favour of increasing the FSR.
- The objectives that CITY PLAN list in table 2 on page 16 of their report do not require an increase in the FSR from 0.6:1 to achieve. That is, an FSR of 0.6:1; (i) will provide housing needs, (ii) can provide variety of housing types, and (iii) the 0.6:1 ratio will provide better land uses than the greater FSR.

- CITY PLAN are being deceptive suggesting a greater FSR improves the amenity of the area.... A ridiculous notion.

On page 12 of their report, CITY PLAN argue that there are other breaches of the FSR in the area, so "me too". Again a ridiculous argument. Imagine how our suburbs would look if this was given any serious consideration?

CITY PLAN are deceptive in a number of other aspects, for example;

- They mention buildings in vicinity that exceed 0.6:1. The 0.6:1 ratio was imposed in the 2007 Control Plan. CITY PLAN fail to mention that most of the buildings that exceed that Control Plan were built prior to 2007.

- In Figure 9, CITY PLAN point to a number of buildings at 1:1 or greater. But they fail to mention that the majority i.e. at least 70% of the buildings in the figure are below 1:1 FSR. So, how can CITY PLAN claim that the "development standard has been abandoned or destroyed"?

- Given the lack of balance and objectivity by CITY PLAN, it would not surprise us that the data as presented is questionable. E.g.

- i. Are the FSR's of other buildings correctly calculated or over-stated?

- ii. The area on Figure 9 will have been chosen to support CITY PLAN's arguments. The FSR of homes to the east of the blue line are ignored because they mostly (if not entirely) comply with the 0.6:1 FSR. This would not be helpful to CITY PLAN's pitch.

2) View Sharing

This proposal doesn't directly affect our views. However, we are very sympathetic to those that are impacted.

On many of the "Proposed Views" prepared by Squillance, the removal of trees, palms and vegetation is shown as an improvement or imply offsets to balance the view reduction by the proposed buildings.

An example is the "before" and "after" views from Level 1 Balcony of 30 Reddall St. indicate the removal of a palm and a tree being replaced by the buildings bulk as somehow 'in balance'. We trust the Council will not be convinced. Imagine how our suburb would look if the planning laws allowed developers to replace vegetation with building bulk!

We often have trees and palms that grow and block views of the ocean. But these are temporary or change over the years as plants naturally change or are maintained or naturally lose branches during storms and droughts. And, in any case, I think we all agree that a view of trees and vegetation is preferable to built structures.

3) Deceptive Statements

Throughout the DA it is clear that the proponent's consultants have not provided balanced impact statements, rather their diagrams and arguments are heavily biased.

Concluding Remarks

I object to this development for the Above reasons. It is frustrating that developers continue to push the planning controls imposed by Council and engage consultants that are willing to present proposals in a more favourable light. Given the resources available to the combined Northern Beaches Council, we trust the Council has ample capacity and experience to ensure the proponent adheres to your rules.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Kind regards
Will Sadler

0404 491 508

Email: wgsadler2@bigpond.com