
Sent: 13/07/2020 6:33:44 PM
Subject: Online Submission

13/07/2020

MR Daniel Grunbaum
4 / 130 Queenscliff RD
Queenscliff NSW 2096
danggrunbaum@outlook.com

RE: DA2020/0666 - 128 Queenscliff Road QUEENSCLIFF NSW 2096

Hi,

See comments below. Happy discuss with anyone involves as necessary, however would prefer my contact details are not made public.

Overshadowing

Shadow diagram provided indicates that there will be additional shadow cast onto 130 Queenscliff Rd. While at 9am the additional shadow does not reduce sunlight to windows or balcony, the drawing indicates that would likely be additional shading onto the balcony at 10am. The impacted unit already received minimal sunlight in mid-winter and therefore any reduction is considered to be significant.

Having said above, the shadow diagram is incorrect. The drawings suggests that the sun's position is slightly south of east at 9am in winter which is where the sun would be at 9am on the summer solstice (azimuth of 94.5 degrees). At 9am in winter, the sun has an azimuth of 42.5 degrees and therefore positioned significantly more northerly than indicated in the drawings. The diagram needs to be corrected, and potentially additional times beyond 9am provided, so the impact on windows or balcony spaces of 130 Queenscliff Rd can be understood.

It should be noted that the accuracy of the shadow diagram was raised in a previous submission to the assessing planner, however the same drawing has been issued with no explanation.

View Loss

The justifications to the view loss associated with the neighbouring dwelling do not appear reasonable. Below summarises key points against the view loss assessment provided in the SEE:

Step 1: This is the primary view of the dwelling impacted (unit 7). So while it may be considered less valuable than views provided by some homes, the quality of view loss should be considered with relativity to what is currently available to the impacted dwelling. Unlike houses, apartments do not have the benefit of the potential for views from all orientations and therefore the maintenance of primary views is key.

Step 2: The view would be impacted when the occupant is in a standing or seated position.

While side views may be difficult to retain, the cause of the view loss is a non-compliance with the DCP.

Step 3: While the view loss could be considered minor and some high quality view remains, in this context it is significant given it is a large portion of the view, it is the primary view of the dwelling and it is associated with its private open space. The view of the ocean would also be considered of high value and is being lost

Step 4: The non-compliance is what is causing the view loss. So while it is a minor non-compliance, it is a significant impact to the dwelling that is impacted.

Happy to discuss any of above.