
From: Aidan watson
Sent: 13/03/2025 9:31:23 AM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: DA2025/0077 8 Undercliff Rd Freshwater Objection Submission
Attachments: DA Objection.pdf;

To Maxwell Duncan and Northern Beaches Council,

Please find attached the objection to DA2025/0077

Please attend our home to obtain a first hand understanding of the impact this proposed development will have on our family.

Regards,

Aidan 

To Maxwell Duncan and Northern Beaches Council,

My family and I strongly object to the current development proposal at 28 Lawrence Steet Freshwater. This is primarily due to the obtrusive nature and scale of the design. This will significantly detract from the current communal feel of our beloved Freshy Village and reduce our quality of life as a Family.

Background:

Our house is located halfway along the proposed development and shares the southern boundary. All our living and entertaining areas face north and are currently filled with beautiful sun light and district views. The house has been strategically configured with a recent renovation to maximise the northerly views, privacy and natural light. The non-compliant proposed design significantly reduces these aspects of our home.

Non-Compliances.

Height:

All aspects of the development envelope are non-compliant against the LEP. Even taking into consideration the affordable housing scheme, the height exceeds the limit by 3m. This requested increase in height will remove the current district views our family enjoys. No variation to the LEP should be permitted, noting the significant impact this will have on adjoining properties.

Visual Impact:

The visual impact study presented is inaccurate and misleading. All photos included within the report (specifically for 8 Undercliff) are outdated and do not represent the northerly direction which the new development will impact our house. **We encourage the Planning Officer to attend our house** and obtain an accurate, firsthand understanding of the visual impact the development will have on our family and adjoining neighbours. Below is a photo taken from the balcony on the mid floor where the main living and kitchen areas are located. This is presumably the location where figure 24 is taken within the report. It can easily be determined that the computer-generated image is inaccurate and minimises the current view loss, 'downplaying' the visual impact resulting from the development. The 1st floor living area will also have no district or sea views due to the enormity of the building causing significant loss of value to the property and enjoyment of use.

Tenacity step 3 states that the impact to 8 Undercliff will be 'moderate' this is inaccurate. It is clear to anyone visiting the property that the impact will be 'high-very high' due to loss of views, sunlight and privacy. This is clearly illustrated within the photos presented.



Pic 1: Photo taken from the balcony at eye level looking directly north.



Pic 2: Figure 25 from VIR accompanied with a 'moderate' impact loss classification.



Pic 3: Photo taken form living/kitchen area looking north. Currently under renovation.

Privacy:

Whilst the proposed design is slightly tiered to stagger the elevation, it is still in breach of the minimum set back requirement of 9m. The lack of architectural presence is also concerning and not in line with other apartments locally. Figure 25 of the visual impact report is a clear indication of this showing full height glazing to the entire length of apartments facing south. This is extremely concerning and will impact the privacy to our family. There are no louvres or screening other than poor attempts to the lower apartment balconies. A good example of privacy being implemented into the design can be viewed in figure 13 of the visual impact report. 11 Lawrence St. Furthermore, the inclusion of a roof top communal entertaining area is out of the question and should not be entertained to any extent.

Acoustic Impact:

Due to the non-confirming setbacks, there will be an unacceptable level of acoustic impact from tenants utilising their balconies. In addition to this, there is a fan room proposed within B1 on the boundary. This will cause vibration and unwanted background noise. This needs to be relocated off the boundary. All roof top plant will require acoustic louvres to comply. All deliveries and rubbish collections need to be made from within the basement car park and not on the street. Using the excuse of a restricted site is not acceptable and should not be considered by the Council. A reduction in apartments would provide the required space to achieve a compliant solution.

Sun light:

3 hrs of minimum sunlight must be adhered to. The sun light diagrams currently do not adhere to this requirement and therefore the design needs to be altered accordingly.

Conclusion:

The Northern Beaches Council has a great responsibility to represent the Community of Freshwater and protect the culture of the Village. Our Family is generally supportive of the modernisation of Freshwater Village. We understand that developments in the area are inevitable and are usually beneficial to the Community.

It is apparent that this design seeks to maximize the return for the developer's investment at the expense of the Community. It is not sympathetic to a Coastal Village and will not blend into the existing streetscape.

We do not support this development. It will have a significant adverse effect on our Family's standard of living and will dilute the existing culture of our beloved Freshy Village. Please listen carefully to the Community when assessing this proposal.