

Double Bay Residents' Association Inc

P.O. Box 1684, Double Bay NSW 1360
Tel: 0414 932 818 Email: dbrassoc@gmail.com

The General Manager,
Woollahra Municipal Council,
PO Box 61,
DOUBLE BAY NSW 1360.

5th March 2021

Dear Sir,

Re DA 14/2021/1 - 21, 23-25, 27 Bay Street, Double Bay

We have inspected the drawings and reports filed for the Applicant in support of this DA for a five storey commercial development on the above site. Our Association and its over 300 resident members oppose the grant of consent to this DA. If approved it would create a gross overdevelopment in breach of Council's LEP 2014 development standards and the fine-grained set of controls in its DCP 2015.

Introductory

Before going to list our grounds of objection we wish to raise two matters. Firstly, one of the most charming streets, if not the most charming, in the Double Bay Centre is Bay Street (South) in the middle of which is set the subject property. Along the eastern or subject property's side, stretching down to Short Street, are a series of charming small frontage two storey properties, including many identified as "character" properties in the Woollahra DCP that are to be retained. Many have gracious front setbacks. The DCP correctly under "Desired future character" at D5.4.4 calls for the following:

- "(a) Retain the existing modest, lot related building widths and retail frontages.*
- (b) Provide setback areas at ground level that can be used for outdoor eating or public circulation"*

This DA fails entirely to retain the existing lot related widths that are the character of the streetscape. Instead, it puts a monolithic 5 storey building in amongst the 2 storey neighbours and obliterates the three lot widths involved. It provides a negligible 1.2m ground floor setback at odds with the over 3m setback of its northern neighbour (a character building that is to be retained under the DCP) and then builds a first floor balcony that encroaches on to the public street.

Much is made in the Applicant's documents of the consent granted by the Land & Environment Court in *Thing Net P/L v Woollahra MC (2020) NSWLEC 1063* for the subject site. We made oral and written submissions to the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel when it rejected that very different DA which had shop top apartments, not offices, and featured an internal light well. However, we were never informed of an appeal being made, still less given a chance to give evidence before the Court. The first we knew of the consent was a few days ago when reading the Applicant's material. We note the Commissioner in his judgment notes "and as no objectors indicated they wished to speak". Would that Council had given us the opportunity!

We submit it should be rejected on the following grounds:

- 1(a) Excessive Height in breach of clause 4.3 of the Woollahra LEP;**
- 1(b) The cl 4.6 request in relation to the breach of the Height standard should be rejected;**
- 2 (a) Excessive FSR/Bulk in breach of clause 4.4 of the Woollahra LEP;**
- 2 (b) The cl 4.6 request in relation to the breach of the FSR standard should be rejected;**
- 3 Breaches of the Woollahra DCP;**
- 4 Encroachment on to public land;**
- 5. Overshadowing, oppressiveness, loss of privacy and view impacts;**
- 6. Car Parking Issues;**
- 7 Contamination (SEPP 55) and Acid Sulphate Soils issues preclude a consent being granted.**

We will deal with those grounds in the above sequence.

1(a) Excessive Height in breach of clause 4.3 of the Woollahra LEP

Under Clause 4.3 of the Woollahra Local Environmental Plan with its accompanying height map the maximum allowable height on this site is 14.7m. The height of this development is at least 17.5m measured in accordance with the LEP **or over 19% exceedance of the maximum permissible height.**

As a result, absent a successful request under clause 4.6 the building cannot be lawfully approved.

1(b) The cl 4.6 request in relation to the breach of the Height standard should be rejected

As already related under “Introductory”, much play is made in the Applicant’s request on the fact that a five storey development was approved for the subject site (DA 33/2018). No notice was given to us of the appeal being on foot (or we believe to surrounding objecting residential owners). However, in any event, the amended design that was before the Commissioner (the top floor was deleted in the course of the appeal) was completely different in nature being shop-top housing with a lower bulk and scale.

In our opinion much assistance in relation to the clause 4.6 objection is to be obtained by the decision in January of this year in *Ricola Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council (LEC 2019/404277)* in which Commissioner Gray refused a DA for nearby 49-53 Bay Street where the proposal exceeded the height limit by 2.9m, almost exactly the same exceedance of the limit as in this case. In particular she found the cl 4.6 request had not satisfied the test set out in “(a)” in the paragraph below.

Accordingly, we would submit that this DA being wholly commercial in character falls to be determined de novo by the application of the principles relating to clause 4.6 objections as laid down by the Court in

in *Four2Five P/L* and *Initial Action*. These decisions have made it clear that an Applicant has to satisfy the consent authority:

- (a) That compliance, (in this case) with the 14.7m (four storey) height limit, is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case. The first and most commonly invoked way is to prove that notwithstanding the non-compliance the objectives of the development standard are achieved.

This is a double hurdle as explained by the Chief Judge at *Initial Action* at 26. Firstly, the consent authority must be satisfied the applicant has adequately addressed this issue (cl 4.6(3)(a)). Secondly the consent authority must itself be satisfied that the objectives of the height standard are achieved notwithstanding the non-compliance (cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)). AND

- (b) That there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention – again a double test (cl 4.6 (3)(b) and cl 4.6 (4)(a)(ii)). AND
- (c) That the development is consistent with the objectives for development within the relevant zone (cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)). Again, the focus is on the element of the development which contravenes the standard (*Initial Action* at 24).

The objectives of the Height standard are set out in clause 4.3 (1) of the LEP.

Objective (a) is:

“to establish building heights that are consistent with the desired future character of the area”.

The desired future character for this site is set out in words and diagrams in the Woollahra DCP at D5.4.4 Bay Street (south) and D5.4.11 Gumtree Lane, along with D5.5.9 Control drawing 5 (to be read with 5.6.3 Urban Character on the same page).

Notably, the building envelope is to be restricted to 4 storeys (see Control drawing 5) defined as a maximum overall height of 14.7m. Along Bay Street the Applicant has proposed a street wall of 13.7m, however as shown on the accompanying diagram in D5.4.4 Bay Street (south) of the DCP the maximum street wall height along the eastern side of Bay Street is 3 storeys or 11.5m.

As noted in italics on page 1 above under the heading “Desired future character” (a) in D5.4.4 it provides:

- “ (a) Retain the existing modest, lot related building widths and retail frontages*
- (b) Provide setback areas at ground level that can be used for outdoor eating or public circulation”*

This development does neither.

In contrast, the proposed development will go from 3 separate frontages 6.07m, 6.10m and 12.17m (see applicants survey) to a combined width of 24.36m (Architectural drawing DA 2001). Rather than retaining the diverse retail frontages currently enjoyed by the community, the proposed development will amalgamate the three (3) sites into one (1). The proposed development is far from modest and would create ill-fitting and prominent bulk along the eastern side of Bay Street (south).

Additionally, the Applicant’s second storey balcony along Bay Street goes beyond the building boundary and encroaches over public land. See our discrete objection under the heading “4. Encroachment on public land “ below.

Furthermore, the applicant has failed to achieve the controls explicitly outlined in D5.4.11 for the “desired future character” of Gumtree Lane. The section drawing requires that the building be setback by 2m for the first two levels with levels three and four (the fifth level should not exist) setback by 8m. The “Desired future character” requirements are:

“(a) Retain the two storey built form and 2m setback on the west side”

“(c) Increase the spatial definition of the lane, and street surveillance with an articulated building addressing the lane from the central triangular site.”

To create the required spatial definition and retain the 2 storey built form, there is a 8m setback for levels 3-5 required along Gumtree Lane. Yet, the applicant has only provided half of what is required, proposing a 4m setback and only providing a 7m setback at 14.67m.

The building envelope for the site is set out in D5.5.9 drawing 5. It requires that only 50% of the area on levels 3-5 between 15.4m from Bay Street and 6m from Bay Street may be built on. The applicant has proposed to build on 100% of this area, an excess of 50%. This differs from the previously approved 33/2018, for an internal lightwell, reducing the internal built area which this development lacks.

The proposal is accordingly not consistent therefore with objective (a) of the Height standard.

Objective (c) of the Height standard is:

“to minimise the loss of solar access to existing buildings and open space”.

We do not accept that this issue is fairly addressed, as the Applicant seeks to do, by saying that the overshadowing is not much worse than caused by the 33/2018. The development has a larger bulk than the approved development. Shadow diagrams have not been provided or, if they have, have not been downloaded on to the Council website with the other applicant’s documents. Only solar access diagrams have been provided. Despite this, it is evident the development will create a significant amount of additional overshadowing of sites to the south and east and additional overshadowing of the public domain to the west and east, due to non-compliant building height and FSR.

Again, the proposal fails to meet or be consistent with the objective.

Objective (d) of the Height standard is:

“to minimise the impacts of new development on adjoining or nearby properties from disruption of views, loss of privacy, overshadowing or visual intrusion”.

The additional upper floor will impact views from a number of surrounding properties. Firstly, the eastern district views of residences directly opposite the site, along Bay Street will be directly impacted by the proposed development: specifically 18 Bay Street and 4-10 Bay Street will be affected.

The Applicant’s contention that the topmost floor will not be seen from Bay Street is transparently false. It may be shielded from view if directly opposite but from other positions further south or north it will be obvious and out of character with this stretch of the street.

In terms of and visual intrusion the proposed Bay St facing windows and balconies will look directly into the private balconies and habitable rooms of residents at 18 Bay Street. The proposed building, which is not setback the at necessary 8m on levels 3-5 as required by the DCP Control drawing, will oppress and dominate Gumtree Lane. The balcony on the upper level of the development facing Gum Tree Lane

intrudes on neighbouring properties open spaces and will oppress and overshadow future development on sites on the far side of the Lane.

Accordingly, the development fails to achieve objective (d).

We submit there are no sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention – again a double test (cl 4.6 (3)(b) and cl 4.6 (4)(a)(ii)). As with *Four2Five* offices could be built on a multitude of other sites within the LEP's Height limit.

2(a) Excessive Bulk/FSR in breach of clause 4.4 of the Woollahra LEP

Under cl 4.4 with its associated map the maximum FSR for the site is 2.5:1 or 2050m² of building area (2.5 x site area 820m²). Assuming the Applicant's gross floor area calculations totalling 2725m² are correct and subject to Council officer's check, the development has an FSR of 3.32:1 and is **33% over the maximum allowable gross floor area**.

It follows that absent a successful clause 4.6 request the development cannot be approved.

2(b) The cl 4.6 request in relation to the breach of the FSR standard should be rejected

This DA differs from that of the approved 33/2018, as, after the initial non-compliant height and an FSR of 3.6:1, the Applicant altered their application to an FSR of 2.48:1. Consequently, this development at as FSR of 3.32:1 has a larger GFA than the approved 33/2018 development. In effect, it then cannot be argued that the final approval for 33/2018 should lead to the approval of this non-compliant DA.

Again, in the recent decision (*Ricola Pty Ltd v Woollahra MC (LEC 2019/404277)*) relating to 49-53 Bay Street, the Court rejected a clause 4.6 request seeking to allow an exceedance of 26% over the permissible maximum FSR. The consent authority should follow that decision and reject this request for a higher exceedance for the same reasons.

We repeat what we said about the tests to be applied to a clause 4.6 objection under section 1(b) above.

The question then is whether the bulk and scale of this DA fulfils the objective of the development standard.

Under clause 4.4 (1)(b) the objective of the B2 zone in regards to bulk and scale is as follows:

"to ensure that buildings are compatible with the desired future character of the area in terms of bulk and scale".

Taking the written part of the DCP description of desired future character, we have already noted that the development flies in the face of the requirement to: *"Retain the existing modest, lot related building widths and retail frontages"*. Its single monolith appearance stretching across three lots is not only discordant with that requirement but also with the existing sweep of small two storey terraces that run along this side of Bay Street down to Short Street. Equally, the development is inconsistent with the other part of the DCP's desired future character: *"Provide setback areas at ground level that can be used*

for outdoor eating or public circulation". Here it sits ill with its northern neighbour with its 3m plus outdoor restaurant area/setback.

It also does not comply with the section sketch under "Desired future character" being Fig 15 under D5.4.4 read with Control drawing 5.5.9 on the Bay Street side. The articulation zone 2.4m deep is not complied with for ground and the first two upper levels – where only a maximum 40% can be external or internal space. The third upper level is not setback the required 2.4m nor is there the required articulation zone for a further depth of 3.5m.

There is no ground floor 2.4m colonnade as required in D5.5.9 Control drawing under the heading 1.6.4 Relationship to public domain.

On the Gumtree Lane side the bulk is even more inconsistent with the desired future character. We repeat what we have put at the top of page 4 above on this issue. It is as applicable to the bulk objective as it is to height.

The clause 4.6 objection must fail so at odds is it with the desired future character of both Bay Street (south) and Gumtree Lane. We submit also that the bulk and scale of this development is incompatible with streetscape and the immediate surrounding areas and we refer again to amenity impacts on those surrounding streetscape as discussed above. The DCP identifies the adjoining nos 29- 37 Bay Street as all "character buildings" of high streetscape value (see D5.5.9 Control drawing 5 under 5.6.3 Urban character and, given the constraints on their redevelopment they are likely to be retained, what one will see is the sheer, blank mass of the proposal's northern side wall looming to five storeys over its recessed two storey neighbours which would ruin the noble streetscape we referred to in our Introduction.

The clause 4.6 request in relation to the FSR breach must be dismissed.

3 Additional breaches of the Woollahra DCP

In dealing with the issue of the proposal's non-compliance with the "desired future character" objective of the Height and FSR standards, we have already covered the building's non-compliance with the envelope controls in the Woollahra DCP – see above. In short it does not comply with:

- The DCP's height limit of 14.7m or 4 storeys;
- The DCP's setback controls on its Bay Street (3.5m upper floors) – the proposed balcony on level 1 will encroach over the building boundary
- The DCP setback control on Gum Tree Lane (8m upper floors)
- The DCP's modest, lot related building widths and retail frontages as per required future character of Bay St
- The DCP envelope control with only 50% of central area to be built on
- The DCP's requirements for a front setback at ground level for outdoor eating as per the required future character of Bay Street and for a colonnade.

5.6.3.1 Building envelopes

Objective 1 Development should contribute to the desired future character of streetscapes with appropriate and consistent building forms.

5.6.3.2 Height

C2 of 5.6.3.2 Height requires the floor level of the uppermost habitable storey must be at least 3.5m under the maximum permissible building height. C3 requires the entire building (including lift tower machinery plant rooms and storage space) must be contained within the envelope height.

5.6.3.4 Setbacks

The development does not meet the Setback Objectives or Controls as outlined below:

Objective 1 "Encourage consistent building lines to provide coherent streetscapes."

The lack of the 2.4m colonnade at ground floor and the required upper floor setbacks fit in ill with the Bay Street streetscape – particularly the character buildings and streetscape to the immediate north. On Gumtree Lane we repeat what we have said at the top of p4 above. The proposed building lines are hopelessly at odds with the controls and existing streetscape.

The consent authority should tread cautiously contrary to the Applicant's submission and require building lines substantially as prescribed within the DCP controls.

Objective 3 "Where indicated provide street setbacks to the upper level of development to permit mid-winter sunlight."

Given the lack of shadow diagrams, we can only note that the development will grossly overshadow popular Bay Street in the morning and Gumtree Lane in the afternoon. If the required 3.5m setback was provided to the Level 4 (the third upper floor) on Bay Street and the 2m setback to ground and first floors and 8m setback to the upper floors on Gumtree Lane, that would enable solar access to both the public domain in Bay Street in the morning and Gumtree Lane (both the public domain and future shop-top housing on the rear of the New South Head properties on the far side of the Lane).

Needless to say, the development breaches each of the following controls in D5.6.3.4:

C1 "Building alignment must comply with the building lines shown on the Built Form Envelopes: Control Drawings, Section 5.5.5 – 5.5.11."

C2 "Front setbacks are identified as building lines on the control drawings, Section 5.5.5 – 5.5.11. Front setbacks must define a coherent alignment to the public domain."

C4 "Rear setbacks must:

(b) protect privacy and facilitate solar access to adjoining buildings and gardens."

C5 "Upper level street setbacks are identified on the control drawings, Section 5.5.5 – 5.5.11. Building articulation excluding floor area elements may be used between the setback line and the street boundary. Refer to Section 5.6.3.3 Building articulation."

5.6.4.1 Awnings

Objective 2 of 5.6.4.1 Awnings is to encourage consistent awning design throughout the centre. The Applicant fails the required minimum soffit height for awnings as outlined in C2, providing a soffit height of 2.7m less than the specified 3.2m minimum.

5.6.4.3 Arcades, walkways and courtyards

C5 of 5.6.4.3 Arcades, walkways and courtyards requires that arcades must have a minimum ceiling height of 3.6m. Instead, the proposed development has a maximum arcade ceiling height of at 2.86m (see Architectural drawing DA 2500) failing the control.

5.6.4.6 Ground floor active lane frontage

Active frontages provide opportunities to stimulate the local economy and providing active frontages along lanes increase foot traffic and enable active surveillance. Under C1 A minimum of 75% active frontage to lanes across the width of a lot is required. The proposed development has not met these minimum requirements, designing an active frontage of only 8m or 33% (see Architectural drawing DA 2402).

4. Encroachment on to public land

Reference has already been made to this issue under section 1(b) on page 3 above. The first upper floor balcony protrudes beyond the property boundary on to Bay Street. While awnings are allowed to encroach, this does not include balconies. The proposed encroachment compromises pedestrian safety and amenity. While the proposed development includes planting along the edge of the balcony there is no guarantee this will be maintained, providing no privacy nor public benefit. We question whether, as part of the development is on Council land, the Council does not have to be joined as an applicant. There is also the issue of the Applicant's lack of any property rights in this space. The consent authority would not as a matter of policy consent to an encroachment on to public land.

5. Overshadowing, oppressiveness, loss of privacy and view impacts

Much of this has been covered in the above submissions, but in brief:

Overshadowing

We are unable to find any shadow diagrams but inevitably Bay Street right across will be overshadowed in the morning and Gumtree Lane (a well-used shortcut from NSH Road to the Cosmopolitan Centre and the pub in Bay St) plus the rear of properties fronting NSH Road in the afternoon.

Oppressiveness

See our "Introductory" above. The property will be like the proverbial sore thumb set amongst its two storey neighbours from NSH Road to Short Street. It will have a particularly unpleasant impact at diners on the well set back (some 3m plus) at the adjoining restaurant at 29 Bay Street and beyond. They will be looking up at a five storey blank end wall as will passers-by. At the rear it compromises future development on the triangular site that extends down to Short Street as well as north facing windows in any redevelopment of the NSH Road properties.

Loss of privacy

The upper floors will look down directly into the residences opposite.

Views

It will have a substantial impact on easterly views from the apartments opposite and will spoil the view from "Overthorpe" which looks down Bay Street from the far side of New South Head Road.

All of these problems could be ameliorated by requiring the building to comply with the standards and building envelope controls.

6. Car Parking Issues

Our first issue is with the excavation for and building of a three storey car park right to all four site boundaries. To begin with this is contrary to the WDCP B3.4 which in Fig 16 provides:

*“For a residential flat building, multi dwelling housing, attached dwellings **and any other land use not addressed in controls C1 to C2 of section B3.4 Excavation, basement walls can be no closer to the boundary than 1.5mMinimum excavation setback 1.5m”** (our emphasis)*

This is an obviously prudent control given the risks of loss of soil, support and amenity to neighbouring properties if excavation is close to boundaries. Indeed, this principle is enshrined in a statutory duty of care not to do anything on or in relation to land that removes the support provided by the supporting land to any other land (Conveyancing Act NSW s 177(2)). This is all the more concerning given that public safety is concerned in the case of the two streets. Both the neighbouring properties appear to be founded on shallow aged strip footings and the excavation would be well within the zone of influence for the foundations to those footings and boundary walls. (Indeed, JK Geotechnics report at p6 puts the influence zone of the excavation “as a horizontal distance of at least 2H (where “H” is the depth of the excavation in metres)”).

A more modest complying development would not mean a need for so many cars meaning that reasonable basement setbacks could be provided.

Our second issue is the dangerous turn into Gumtree Lane off New South Head Road. Currently the New South Head Road right hand lane coming east down the hill from Edgecliff is for most of the day blocked by vehicles waiting to turn right into Manning Road, meaning that vehicles tear down the one remaining left hand lane. The driver to get to this car park would suddenly have to stop to turn left off that left hand lane into Gumtree Lane where presently hardly a vehicle, except for the occasional trade or rubbish collection vehicle, goes.

The third issue is the traffic consultant’s notion of how vehicles from the east would access the one-way Gumtree Lane – “Trips from the east would turn right from New South Head Road into Knox Street, then turn left into Bay Street, New South Head Road and Gumtree Lane” (p16). No one seems to have told the author that Knox Street is about to be pedestrianised from Short Street to its junction with Bay Street. Since Short Street is one way west to east the consultant’s proposed route will be impossible.

All of the above issues underline the importance of any development on the site complying with the controls, thus leading to a more modest parking requirement which in turn would avoid the above nightmare issues.

7 Contamination (SEPP 55) and Acid Sulphate Soils issues preclude a consent being granted

The fact that this issue is dealt with last should not obscure its importance. On the material filed by the Applicant **we say no valid consent can be granted.**

The site is Class2 land on the LEP’s acid sulphate soils map. This means that any excavation beneath ground level requires consent under clause 6.1(2) of the WLEP. Clause 6.1(3) provides:

“Development consent must not be granted under this clause unless an acid sulphate soils management plan has been prepared for the proposed works in accordance with the Acid Sulfate (sic) Soils Manual and has been provided to the consent authority.”

It is not in issue that no acid sulphate soils management plan has been prepared. JK Environments at page (iii) of their "Preliminary (Stage 1) Site Investigation" say:

"An Acid Sulfate Soil (ASS) assessment should be undertaken to establish the potential for actual or potential ASS to be present, and assess the need to prepare an ASS management plan."

In the light of those words this is not a case falling within the exception provided by clause 6.1(4) of the LEP:

"Despite subclause (2), development consent is not required under this clause for the carrying out of works if:

- (a) A preliminary assessment of the proposed works prepared in accordance with the Acid Sulfate Soils Manual indicates that an acid sulfate soils management plan is not required for the works ..."*

As we have seen from the above quote from JK Environments report they do not say that an ASSMP is not required but leave that issue open for future assessment.

We annex as annexure "A" the Memorandum of Advice by Peter McEwen SC obtained in relation to earlier developments in Cross Street in which Mr McEwen advises that clause 6.1(3) means what it says and that this matter cannot be cured or left to be resolved by a deferred commencement or other condition of consent. (Council subsequently obtained advice from Mr Lindsay Taylor, solicitor, who in substance agreed with Mr McEwen SC). A consent granted without satisfying in terms clause 6.1(3) or (4) will be invalid.

Precisely the same issue arises in relation to SEPP 55 and contamination. At page 17 of the JK Environments report the authors acknowledge that:

*"The site has been used as a dry cleaner business which is listed in Table 1 of the SEPP 55 Planning Guidelines as an activity that may cause contamination. **On this basis, a detailed (Stage 2) site investigation (DSI) is required.**"* (our emphasis)

Clause 7 of SEPP 55 is in similar terms to clause 6.1 of the WLEP:

"Contamination and remediation to be considered in determining development application

- (1) A consent authority must not consent to the carrying out of any development on land unless:
 - (a) It has considered whether the land is contaminated, and*
 - (b) If the land is contaminated, it is satisfied that the land is suitable in its contaminated state (or will be suitable, after remediation) for the purpose for which the development is proposed to be carried out, and*
 - (c) If the land requires remediation to be made suitable for the purpose for which the development is proposed to be carried out, it is satisfied that the land will be remediated before the land is used for that purpose.**
- (2) Before determining an application for consent to carry out development that would involve a change of use on any of the land specified in subclause (4), the (2) (2) Before determining an application for consent to carry out development that would involve a change of use on any of the land specified in subclause (4), the consent authority must consider a report specifying the findings of a preliminary investigation of the land concerned carried out in accordance with the contaminated land planning guidelines."*

The JK Environments report at p17 acknowledges that they have not done the report called for by clause 7(2) nor are they in a position to advise on the issues posed for the consent authority in clause 7(1).

They say:

“A detailed (Stage 2) site investigation (DSI) should be undertaken to characterise the site contamination conditions and establish whether the site is suitable for the proposed development, or whether remediation is required”.

In this situation Mr McEwen’s clear advice is that a consent authority cannot grant a valid consent, the matter cannot be dealt with by deferred commencement or other condition and any purported consent granted is liable to be struck down by the Court.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons our Association says that the subject application should be refused.

We would ask to be given reasonable advance notice of the meeting of the consent authority at which the DA will be considered and the opportunity to address such meeting. We would also ask for the courtesy of an early supply of Council’s staff report.

Yours faithfully,

DOUBLE BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INC

Per Malcolm Young, President

Michelle Palmer M Urb & Regional Planning