

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

20th December 2018

Dear Sir,

DA 359/2017/1 30-36 Bay Street and 2 Guilfoyle Avenue, Double Bay (L & E Court 96696 of 2018)

This Association has inspected the drawings and supporting reports belatedly made available by Council in support of the Applicant's Amended Proposal.

Our Association representing some 300 local residents strongly object to the Amended Proposal and say that the Court (or other consent authority) should **refuse** consent for the reasons set out below.

By way of overarching comment, we would point out that the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel in its recent determinations on DA 33/2018/1 for 21-27, Bay Street and DA 617/2017/1 at 28-34 Cross Street has decisively rejected 6 storey development in this part of the Double Bay Centre and dismissed the associated clause 4.6 objections to compliance with the height and FSR development standards in the Woollahra LEP 2014. To quote part of its reasons in rejecting the former DA: "the Panel believes that an approval of this application would make it more difficult to uphold those standards for future applications on other sites". The same damage to the integrity of these controls would occur if the consent authority were to approve this 6 storey Amended Proposal.

All the more is this the case where the developer could easily have complied with the 5 storey limit that applies to the 30-36 Bay Street part of the site if it had not chosen to put that most unattractive form of development, an above-ground parking floor, at 1st upper floor level and instead have provided parking at basement level as in its superceded application.

The grounds on which this Amended Proposal should be rejected are:

- 1 (a) Excessive height – breach of the Height standard in Woollahra LEP 2014;
- (b) The clause 4.6 objection to compliance with the Height standard should be rejected;
- 2 (a) Excessive bulk – breach of the FSR standard in Woollahra LEP 2014;
- (b) No clause 4.6 objection filed so no power to approve;

- 3 Non-compliance with SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide;
- 4 Breaches of Woollahra DCP 2015;
- 5 Loss of commercial space and employment generating uses – Inconsistency with Council’s Planning Proposal (gateway determination requested) to require minimum non-residential FSR of 1.3:1 (not including car parking), zone objectives and DCP control;
- 6 Noise and unsightliness impacts of 1st floor parking;
- 7 Inadequate parking;
- 8 Specific amenity impacts – Loss of views, Loss of privacy, Overshadowing, Oppressiveness and Noise;
- 9 The development fails to comply with the transitional principle;
- 10 Absence of required colonnading.

1 (a) Excessive height – breach of the Height standard in Woollahra LEP 2014

The point from which the height is to be measured is RL 2.86 and the top of the building is at RL 24.12. The height of the building on the 30-36 Bay Street portion of the site is therefore 21.26m (see drwg DA 3000 Q and the cl 4.6 objection, first paragraph).

The maximum permitted height under the development standard is 18.1m for that part of the site. It exceeds the standard therefore by 3.16m (17.5%) or approximately one floor.

There is no power to approve the Amended Proposal absent a successful objection under clause 4.6 of the LEP (see also the principles set out in *Four2Five P/L v Ashfield Council (2015) NSWLEC 90*).

1 (b) The clause 4.6 objection (as filed) to compliance with the Height standard should be rejected

The Applicant’s cl 4.6 objection seeks to rely on the building approximately matching the height of the Cosmopolitan Centre on the other side of Bay Street. However, this is a building decades old that was not approved under the current controls. Indeed, the LEP preceding the current LEP did not even have a height development standard.

It remains true that the majority of buildings in the commercial part of Bay Street are 2 storey terraces with a few being 3 or 4 storey. The 6 storey proposal is therefore out of character with the existing character notwithstanding that the Applicant bases its case on a height similar to one building in that street.

The first enquiry must be as to whether the proposed 6 storey height fulfils the following objectives of the Height standard as set out in clause 4.3 (1) of the LEP. We say it fails this test.

Objective “(a) – to establish building heights that are consistent with the desired future character of the neighbourhood”

The desired future character of this property in the centre section of Bay Street is set out in the Woollahra DCP 2015 at D 5.4.5 as amplified by the control drawing for the site at D 5.5.9.

Dealing firstly with the Amended Proposal as fronting Bay Street, it is hopelessly inconsistent with the stated desired future character. At ground floor level there is no 2.4m wide colonnade as required (see D5.4.5 at “(b)” and the property specific requirement on D5.5.9 under the heading “setbacks” 5.6.3), only a token 1m setback. At upper floor level the desired future character requires a 2.4m articulated zone of which only a maximum 40% may be internal or external space (see D5.5.9 item 5.3.6 “Articulation”). The 1st floor has zero articulation with negligible setback and an uninterrupted blank wall protecting a carpark. On upper floors 2-4 instead of the max 40%, 100% is occupied with balcony space. The 5th upper floor should not of course exist under the LEP and DCP envelope controls – the desired character being for a 5, not 6, storey building.

There is also substantial inconsistency with the desired future character for the Guilfoyle Ave frontage. At D 5.5.9 (under the heading 5.6.3 “Setbacks”) it requires “a 2.4m (setback) for colonnades”. Even more specifically on page D 5.5.9 under the heading 1.6.4 the DCP states “Colonnades must be constructed on the ground floor frontage of Guilfoyle Avenue”. No colonnade at all is provided, let alone of the required depth of 2.4m. Instead there is a shallow and irregular ellipsis provided to part of the frontage with none of the comfort and utility to shoppers of the required 2.4m colonnade. Contrast this with the Chancellor building on the opposite corner of Guilfoyle Avenue where the gracious required colonnade is provided.

The 1st floor on this frontage with its shallow ellipsis and mainly blank wall does not comply with the articulation requirements stated two paragraphs above. Upper levels 2-3 do not appear to comply either and the upper level 5 should not be there at all.

By way of further conflict with the desired future character, whereas D5.5.9 under 1.6.5 “Landscaped areas” dictates that the southern and western parts of the site “must include landscaped areas as indicated”. Instead of complying with this, the proposal covers the indicated areas with buildings.

Objective “(b) – to establish a transition in scale between zones to protect local amenity”

This is truly a transitional site being right on the boundary of the residential zone. That residential zone has a 3 storey height limit. It is therefore particularly important that the 5 storey height limit on the 30/36 Bay St portion of the site be observed in order to create that transition in scale. The proposed 6 storeys fails the objective.

Objective “(c) – to minimise the loss of solar access to existing buildings and open space”

The attempt in the shadow diagrams to minimise the extent of overshadowing by reference to an unillustrated, allegedly complying structure should be treated with suspicion. It is obvious that the non-complying sixth storey will substantially worsen the overshadowing of open space in the form of the popular junction of Bay St and Cooper St in the morning. In the afternoon shadows will stretch up the walls of the Cosmopolitan Centre and its apartments (as well as 41 and 43 Bay St both of which may well have residential upstairs in the future).

Objective “(d) – to minimize the impacts of new development on adjoining or nearby properties from disruption of views, loss of privacy, overshadowing or visual intrusion”

Also not achieved. The immediate neighbours across the street in the Cosmopolitan Centre will suffer the looming bulk of a 6 storey building opposite with loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy, and

oppressive bulk – impacts which would be avoided largely by a complying development. There are afternoon overshadowing impacts on 41 and 43 Bay St. There are disastrous impacts in terms of overshadowing, oppressive bulk, and loss of privacy for properties such as 3 and 5 South Avenue as well as similar if not quite so extreme impacts on 24 Bay St and properties adjoining on the South side of Cooper St. In terms of more distant views many properties on the amphitheatre (including buildings such as Overthorpe, 290 New South Head Road, Bibaringa and 4 Henrietta Street) surrounding the Centre will lose their north easterly views to the harbour because of the sixth storey whereas a building complying with the controls would much better preserve those views.

Objective “e) – to protect the amenity of the public domain by providing public views of the harbor and surrounding areas”

(e) is similarly not achieved. Public views of the harbour from places along New South Head Rd and Edgecliff Road will be affected – and this is also true of the view down Bay street northwards to the harbour where a 6 storey building built right on its boundary with none of the colonnading required by our DCP will block and dominate the left hand half of the view. Similarly there will be a disastrous impact on views from Guilfoyle Park where, instead of the gentle transition from the Centre to the R2 zone implicit in the LEP and DCP height controls, there will be seen the discordant 6 storeys high dwarfing the low rise development along Guilfoyle Avenue. Sensibly the building should match the other gateway building on the opposite corner of Guilfoyle Avenue, the Chancellor, which is mainly 4 storey with a 5th floor heavily recessed from all street frontages.

The objectives of the LEP’s height control are accordingly not achieved notwithstanding the non-compliance and the clause 4.6 objection should be rejected.

It is to be noted that the development also fails the additional requirements of clause 4.6 which require that:

- * there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard (cl 4.6 (3)(b)); and that
- * the proposed development will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the particular standard and the objectives for development within the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out (cl 4.6 (4)(a)(ii)).

There are no sufficient environmental planning grounds justifying the contravening sixth storey. As in *Four2Fivesuch* residential accommodation could be built anywhere else within the zone.

Moreover, the development is inconsistent with a number of the zone objectives for the B2 Local Centre:

“ To provide a range of retail, business, entertainment and community uses that serve the needs of people who live in, work in and visit the local area”

This greatly reduces the stock of office accommodation presently available on the upper two floors of the existing building replacing these with a puny commercial area of 211m² on the 1st upper floor.

“ To encourage employment opportunities in accessible locations”

This greatly reduces employment opportunities by getting rid of the present two upper floors of offices, replacing them only in employment terms by the puny 211m² of commercial on the first upper floor.

“ To attract new business and commercial opportunities”

This reduces such opportunities by getting rid of the two existing upper office floors.

‘To provide for development of a scale and type that is compatible with the amenity of the surrounding residential area’

Six storeys and a driveway/ upper parking floor directly adjacent to the neighbouring apartments are features that are incompatible with the amenity of the surrounding residential area. A building that was similar to the graceful colonnaded Chancellor on the opposing corner of Guilfoyle Avenue (4 storeys with a deeply recessed 5th storey) would be compatible.

‘ To ensure that development is of a height and scale that achieves the desired future character of the neighbourhood’

We repeat all we have said under *“Objective (a)”* of the Height standard commencing on p2 above. The height and scale are excessive in the context of Bay Street, Guilfoyle Avenue and the low-rise residential properties adjoining in South Avenue and Cooper Street.

Accordingly, the proposal fails also the test posed by the reference to zone objectives in cl 4.6 (4) (a)(ii).

The somewhat faint attempt to rely on abandonment of the height control in the Applicant’s cl 4.6 objection should be swiftly dismissed. There has only been one single instance (26 Cross Street) where Council has permitted a 6 storey development in breach of its height control in this LEP, and the S.E.C.P.P in its original decision on this DA correctly and specifically dismissed this argument. One exception cannot amount to abandonment.

2 (a) Excessive bulk – breach of the FSR standard in Woollahra LEP 2014

There are different FSR controls applicable to the 30-36 Bay Street part of the site to those on the 2, Guilfoyle Avenue part.

To both the FSR map gives a maximum FSR of 2.5:1 but the Applicant seeks to take advantage of cl 4.4A (3) in the LEP which permits a maximum of 3:1 on 30-36 Bay Street;

“if the consent authority is satisfied that the development will be compatible with the desired future character of the zone in terms of building bulk and scale”.

According to the SEE the 30-36 Bay Street part has an FSR of 3:1. It seems to assume that it satisfies the test that we have just italicized. No cl 4.6 objection appears in the filed material.

We would take issue with that assumption and say that the consent authority could not be satisfied that the proposed 6 storeys on 30-36 Bay Street is compatible with the cl 4.4A (3) test.

We have already referred to the desired future character sections of the DCP in dealing with “*Objective (a)*” under the Height issue (p2 above and following). The desired future character shows a 5, not 6, storey building on this corner. It has bulk softened both by articulation requirements and colonnading – both absent from this design. It shows a building which is restricted to the northern and eastern portions of 30-36 Bay Street with the southern and western part devoted to landscaping (see also DCP 5.6.5.3). This design builds over the entire block. It must be borne in mind that many of the nearby buildings in Bay Street are listed “character” buildings in the DCP that are to be retained (nos 14, 24-26, 9-15, 29-37 and 45A Bay Street - see 5.4.4 “c”, 5.6.3 and 5.6.3.8). The future character of the street will accordingly be predominantly low-rise. On the Guilfoyle Avenue frontage it fits ill with the neighbouring residential zone (3 storey max) and the complying Chancellor on the opposite corner.

2 (b) – No clause 4.6 objection filed so no power to approve.

If our submission under 2 (a) above is accepted, then the development on 30-36 Bay Street must be refused since there has been no written request from the applicant under cl 4.6 (3).

3 Non-compliance with SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide

We draw your attention to the following non-compliances with the Apartment Design Guide which applies to the humblest unit development in the State:

(a) Inadequate building separation

The ADG (2F) requires a building separation of 18 m between habitable rooms or balconies for buildings of this height (five to eight storeys). Essentially that requires that those spaces be setback at least 9m from the boundaries, so that the neighbor similarly sets back a further 9m to achieve compliance. In this case there is nil setback on the southern side up to and including the sixth level and neighbours and the public to the south are left staring at a six storey high blank end wall. This has disastrous consequences for the neighbours to the south and south-west in terms of overshadowing, loss of privacy, views and light, oppressiveness and loss of north-easterly breezes.

Even at the lower floor level (ground to 3rd upper floor level) of course the building is hopelessly non-compliant with the 4.5m setback required to both the western and southern side boundaries. On each side it has nil setback.

(b) Units lack cross ventilation

On upper floors 2 and 3 half the units (specifically those identified as Units 2 and 3, both 4 bedroom, on DA 2003 N) lack the cross ventilation required by section 4B. On upper level 4 the centre of three units, (Unit 10, 3 bedrooms, on DA 2005 L) lacks the required cross ventilation similarly. One of the other 2 units on that level (Unit 9, 3 bedrooms, on DA 2005 L) has only the tiniest window by a bathroom on its southern side and hopelessly fails to provide the quality of cross ventilation shown 4B Fig 4B.3 of the ADG. On the top floor Unit 12 has very poor cross ventilation save at its western extremity.

We say the test of at least 60% units being naturally cross ventilated (Objective 4B-3) is unsatisfied.

c) Deep soil zones

We have already drawn attention at page 3 above to the non-compliance with the site specific DCP requirement that this site have landscaped areas as shown – D5.5.9 at 1.6.5 – on its southern and south-western side. The failure to provide any landscaped area as shown is also a breach of the ADG's requirement at Objective 3E-1 that the site have not less than 7% of the site area as a deep soil zone with a minimum dimension of 3m for this size site.

Covering this south and SW side of the site with ground floor 100% buildings precludes any screening and the proposed first floor terrace looks directly into neighbours to the south.

(d) Parking and Bicycles (3J)

The proposed 1st upper floor carpark breaches Objective 3J-4 which provides "Protrusion of car parks should not exceed 1m above ground level". This reflects the visual unattractiveness and noisiness of above ground car parking floors. The same objective requires integrated ventilation grills or screening devices to be integrated into the façade. We cannot see any evidence of this.

To access the storage area shown on that floor involves crossing a car parking space in direct breach of Objective 3J-3.

We can see no evidence of secure undercover bicycle parking as required by Objective 3J-2 – nor of "conveniently located and sufficient numbers of parking spaces (being) provided for motorbikes and scooters" as there required.

e) Communal and public open space (3D)

Objective 3D-1 requires communal open space of a minimum 25% of the site receiving a minimum 50% sunlight for a minimum 2 hours mid-winter. We would query whether the two terraces shown at 2nd upper floor level are communal space at all since they can only be accessed at that level, are not "co-located with a deep soil area" and in one case does not have the min 3m depth. They would receive virtually no winter sun and comprise only 9% of the site area. They look directly into bedrooms.

(f) Storage

4G-1 requires at least 10m² storage in addition to storage in kitchens, bathrooms and bedrooms be provided for 3 and 4 bedroom apartments such as these and 4G-2 requires that, if not in apartments, such storage be clearly allocated to specific apartments. Of the six units on upper levels 2 and 3 only Unit 4 appears to have a tiny amount of in-apartment storage. Of the 3 units on upper level 4 none appear to have in-apartment storage (ignoring the letters "ST" placed over a double bed in U 11!). Neither of the units on the top floor appear to contain storage. That only leaves a small store of about 9m² on the parking level which can only be accessed by crossing a parking space. Obviously, the storage falls hopelessly short of ADG objectives.

4. Breaches of Woollahra DCP 2015

Since a number of these have already been referred to, these are dealt with in bullet point form. In some cases, the non-compliances are also areas of non-compliance with SEPP 65 and the ADG (see 3 above) which supercedes a DCP requirement and such cases are omitted.

- (a) Breach of height and storey limit as shown in D5.5.9 Control Drawing 5 which limits development on 30-36 Bay Street to 5 storeys (18.1m). The sixth storey should be eliminated.
- (b) Breach for the whole site of the site-specific requirement in the same Control Drawing and D5.6.3 under "Setbacks" for a 2.4m wide colonnade along the whole of both street frontages. See also D5.6.4.2 where the importance of colonnades to Guilfoyle Park is specifically mentioned. Note the graceful complying colonnade on The Chancellor on the opposite corner of Guilfoyle Avenue.
- (c) Breach of the requirement on the same Control Drawing for a 1.8m setback for all upper floors on the site's western boundary with 4-10 Guilfoyle Avenue – the first three upper floors being built right on the site boundary.
- (d) Breach of the Articulation requirement on the same Control Drawing and at D5.6.3 ("Articulation") that along the street frontages for a depth of 2.4m limits the amount of built internal and external space to 40%. Similarly breached is the same articulation requirement for a 2m depth at the rear of the building.
- (e) Breach of the site-specific requirement for a rear landscaped area as shown on the same Control Drawing and under 1.6.5 Amenity (Landscaped areas). See also 5.6.5.3 and Fig 49 showing this landscaped area on the subject site and highlighting its importance as a transition to the adjoining residential properties. None is provided. In direct breach of Control C1 in 5.6.5.3 the area is covered by building.
- (f) The same control drawing limits the depth of the building on both street frontages to 12m. This is wildly exceeded at ground and 1st floor levels and substantially exceeded on the floors above.
- (g) In breach of 5.6.5.3 Control C2 ("Car parking should be located under the building footprint to maximise deep soil landscaped areas") car parking is located at 1st floor level. See also the breach of 5.6.8.1 On-site parking to similar effect. Indeed, the original DA had basement parking. D 5.6.8.3 says:

"Where basement car parking is not possible, first floor car parking may be permitted"

There is no evidence basement parking is impossible here.

See also under "Parking" below.

- (h) In breach of Control C3 in D5.6.2:

*"Design for retail, commercial and community uses at ground **and first floor levels"***

The majority of the first floor is given over to parking and a ramped driveway.

5 Loss of commercial space and employment generating uses – inconsistency with Council’s Planning Proposal (gateway determination requested) to require minimum non-residential FSR of 1.3:1 (not including car parking), zone objectives and DCP control

In October Council, following advice from the Woollahra Local Planning Panel, resolved to proceed to submit a Planning Proposal to the Greater Sydney Commission with a request for a gateway determination to allow public exhibition and delegation of the plan making steps under the EP&A Act.

Annexed as “A” is a copy of the Agenda Recommendation and Report and the resultant resolution of the Environmental Planning Committee of 15 October 2018. We refer in particular to p399 at “2.1 Objective”. The Planning Proposal will amend the LEP so as to require a minimum non-residential FSR of 1.3:1. In effect it will mandate retail or office use of the ground and first floors.

The site is currently occupied by a 3 storey building with ground floor retail and offices on the two floors above.

The current proposal destroys a valued office building and the jobs that go with it. The total retail and commercial areas on the two floors totals 782m² against a site area of 1111.8m², thus yielding an approximate FSR of .7:1, barely half the minimum required by the draft development standard in the Planning Proposal.

Whilst it is appreciated that the Planning Proposal has yet to go on public exhibition and reach the stage of s4.15(1)(a) (ii) of the Act, we do say this loss of commercial space is relevant as a “social and economic impact in the locality” under s 4.15(1)(b) of the Act.

It is also fatally inconsistent with the first three zone objectives to which we have drawn attention at pages 4/5 above. In the DCP it is inconsistent with D5.6.2 quoted above under section 4 (h).

6 Noise and unsightliness impacts of 1st floor parking

We refer to the breach of the DCP’s control requiring on-site parking to be located under the building footprint – see our objection under section 4(g) above.

Firstly, the ramped driveway to the 1st floor carpark is located directly adjacent to apartments in the adjoining 4-10, Guilfoyle Avenue, who will have their rest and peace disturbed by vehicles ascending and descending the ramp and the echoing roar of their engines and squeal of tyres. The parking, the inadequacy of which we address in the next section, should be restored to the basement where it was in the original DA which would also enable more adequate parking to be provided.

Secondly, as well as noise emanating from the ramp and the noise-box of the carpark itself, there will be more pollution.

Thirdly, there is the unsightliness of blank external walls at 1st floor level which will not be masked by the partial planter shown on part of the Guilfoyle Avenue frontage, a planter which has no apparent access for maintenance.

7 Inadequate parking

Residents living in and around the Centre experience daily the frustration of not being able to find parking on street for their own cars or those of visitors and tradesmen. It has long since reached crisis point and is steadily worsening. Public transport is not good – Edgecliff Station being too distant and the buses not going into the office centre of the City, merely passing along Park Street to Walsh Bay.

Against this background it is vital that this development satisfies the realistic parking requirements of the proprietors, staff and visitors of the retail and commercial space as well as the residents of and visitors to the apartments. It fails miserably to do this.

The minimum requirements of the DCP E1.5 for the non-residential parking proposed is calculated as follows:

Retail area 442m @ 3.3 spaces per 100m² x .6 = 8.8 spaces

Commercial 352m² @ 2.5 spaces per 100m² x .6 = 5.3 spaces

Instead the developer proposes to provide **ZERO** parking for the retail and commercial! We are appalled by the suggestion in the SEE, if true, that this has been “agreed to” by Council.

Even the allowance for residential and their visitors (20) is inadequate. There are proposed 8 x 4 bedroom and 5 x 3 bedroom apartments. It cannot seriously be doubted that in practice units of this size and population in an affluent area are going to have 2 cars per unit and the DCP requires a further 3 for visitors (total 29). It is true that these residential rates are strangely expressed as maxima but the DCP at E 1.4.2 (p9) says that: “the parking provided should not be substantially below the maximum rates”.

Again, if the parking were restored to a basement parking floor, these shortfalls could be remedied.

8. Specific amenity impacts – Loss of views, Loss of privacy, Overshadowing, Oppressiveness and Noise

Most of these impacts have been mentioned above.

The units on the Bay Street frontage of the Cosmopolitan Centre opposite will suffer view loss, loss of privacy, some overshadowing in the afternoon and an oppressive 6 storey structure right in their face. It does not have the setbacks of upper floors that the Cosmopolitan Centre has. They will also suffer increased noise in what is already a noisy area at night because of the nearby bars and restaurants, because the 6 storeys will create an echoing canyon.

The residential properties to the immediate south west of the site will suffer hugely – a 6 storey wall being built to their north east leading to loss of views, loss of privacy (note the overlooking from the first floor terrace where the DCP requires landscaping), overshadowing, oppressiveness, noise as well as the loss of the cooling summer nor’easterly.

The adjoining apartments at 4-10, Guilfoyle Avenue, will suffer particularly from noise – see particularly our comments under section 6 above.

Buildings such as The Chancellor and 45, Cross Street will have their local and district views affected by the extra storey. The former will have to look at the blank first floor carpark wall.

A large number of residents in streets such as New South Head Road and Henrietta Street have iconic harbour views across the subject site which will be spoilt if the sixth floor is permitted. We instance for example buildings such as Overthorpe, Bibaringa, 290 New South Head Road and properties in Henrietta Street such as no 4. Indeed, there is a swathe of buildings coming down the hill from Edgecliff (some of them under construction) whose views across the site will be impacted.

9. The development fails to comply with the transitional principle

See under “*Objective (b)*” on page 3 above.

It is a trite principle of good planning that, on the edges of commercial zones such as this, buildings should graduate down so as harmonise with the neighbouring residential zone which has of course a 3 storey height limit.

10. Absence of required colonnading

See our comments at the top of page 3 as well as at section 4(b) above.

Conclusion

We have written to Council without receiving any reply on the issue of whether and when this Amended Proposal will be referred back to the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel. We have also written to Council, again without receiving any reply, indicating that in our view it would be inappropriate for this matter to be determined by the Commissioner who engaged in without prejudice discussions between the parties at the s34 conference that may have some nexus with the submission of the amended plans.

Representing some 300 local residents as we do, we trust that we will receive answers to our unanswered questions concerning the future course of this matter. As mentioned at the outset the submission of this objection has been very substantially delayed by the inability of staff to download the Amended Proposal on to its website. We are aware that many individual objectors have had their responses delayed for that reason.

We look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Yours faithfully,

DOUBLE BAY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INC

Per Malcolm Young, Vice President

