

**From:** [DA Admin Mailbox](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FW: DA2024/1612. 27 Arnhem Rd  
**Date:** Wednesday, 16 April 2025 1:18:06 PM

---

---

**From:** helen pretious [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 14 April 2025 1:40 PM  
**To:** Dean Pattalis [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Moir Mobile [REDACTED]; Andrew Murphy  
[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** re: DA2024/1612. 27 Arnhem Rd

Hi Dean,

Following our conversation on Friday, I wanted it noted that we disagree with many of the assumptions and findings of the view assessment prepared by Planning Outcomes, who have not been on site at 7 Sunlea Place. The photo montage was incorrectly placed and had to be amended on a photo taken by the council on a mobile phone camera at a wide angle.

Depending on the angles of the photo it leads to perspective distortion, and planning outcomes have not taken this into account, using trees that are further away from the property as a guide.

Furthermore many of the findings in the view assessment document are also incorrect and highlight the fact that it was completed by someone who has not visited the property. These include:

1. “The views to ocean-canopy interface at horizon are obtained while standing. When sitting the view is expected to show only the sky-canopy interface.” This is incorrect, the ocean-canopy view is seen from seated.
2. “No iconic view present.” This is incorrect as we have a view of North Head.
3. It states that we only have “ocean glimpses”, when in fact the view is panoramic due to elevation, from Curl Curl to North Head.

4. It states that the “View can only be seen good weather/ clear days.” When in fact the view can be seen on cloudy days and light rain and we can see bad weather rolling in across the ocean. Granted, when it rains heavily this limits the view, which is very infrequent.
5. The photo montage doesn’t take into account that our perspective is from the rear and side combined. The view loss will not be a triangular roof as seen on the photo montage from the rear, it will also be a straight ridge line as seen from the side. The photo montage doesn’t take this into account.
6. It lists one photo from a “kitchen balcony”. This is incorrect, the rear balcony is attached to our living room and cannot be accessed from the kitchen.
7. It states that the view and ocean can only be seen from kitchen, living room and balcony. This is incorrect as it can also be viewed from the rear bedroom. Additionally, the ocean can also be seen from the lower floor living room and study.
8. It states that the view loss to the horizon is “minor to moderate” from the kitchen. When in fact we will lose nearly all of the view and should surely be classed as severe to devastating. It states the view loss from the kitchen balcony (living balcony not attached to kitchen) is minor and that the view will in the majority will be maintained. This is completely incorrect.

Finally, 25 Arnhem Road also has a DA in progress. The 2 DAs together cause a much greater cumulative view loss and as such we suggest an independent view assessment be completed that takes this and the above factors into consideration.

Kind regards

Helen