
Sent: 8/01/2019 4:29:11 PM
Subject: Online Submission

08/01/2019

MR Ken Smith
12 Courtley RD
Beacon Hill NSW 2100
ken@vmxmag.com.au

RE: DA2018/1886 - 10 Courtley Road BEACON HILL NSW 2100

I have the following concerns/objections regarding the development at 10 Courtley Road.

1. Privacy

The re-orientation of the house on the block has brought the building closer to our backyard, our private open space on our verandah and to our swimming pool. The existing balcony at No. 10 is angled away from our private open space, is not adjacent to our rear boundary and is currently shrouded, for the most part, by existing vegetation (in the properties of Nos. 12 and 14).

The proposed balcony off Bed 1 overlooks and faces directly into our private open space verandah and outdoor eating area and looks directly over our swimming pool. The balcony is situated so that it could easily double as a diving platform into our swimming pool. The report by Planning Approvals on Page 50 states that - "The first floor balcony off Bed 1 faces the side boundary, however is substantially smaller in area than the existing first floor balcony facing the same direction of the dwelling to be demolished." It is smaller but it is located in a different position and oriented differently, now facing our pool and private open space directly. It doesn't really matter if the proposed balcony - "will be used infrequently or for short durations" it will have a serious impact on our privacy when it is used.

The planting alongside this boundary will not provide a sufficient privacy screen no matter what height they reach - the balcony is quite simply poorly positioned in respect of privacy for our property.

Further, the garbage bin area, adjacent to the front of the garage, is located on a platform that will significantly overlook our private open space. The height of that bin area, and the adjacent walkway along the side of the house towards the rear of the property, is such that any person walking along that walkway or using that bin area, will look straight into our private open space. The top of the existing boundary fence will be lucky to reach waist level of anyone walking in that area, rendering the boundary fence useless as a privacy measure. The 'pencil pines' slated for part of that boundary will not provide an adequate screen. To afford us any privacy, those plantings would need to be 'super advanced' and 'bushier' than pencil pines as well as being planted closer together, i.e. planting that will effectively screen that bin area and walkway given that they severely overlook our property.

2. Bulk and scale on boundary and building layout

The "significant rotation of the orientation of the building" as noted in the report on Page 49, does indeed bring benefits to the North West (side) and South East, South West (rear). The

report fails to note the rotation does exactly the opposite for our property No. 12 as it gives us significant single and double storey elevations directly on our boundary. This will be very imposing as not only has the new building been oriented to have the majority of its bulk on our boundary, it has made that impact even worse by pushing the building further forward towards its front boundary.

The report goes on to say that - "The new position of the dwelling will also provide for varying building setbacks to those boundaries, creating a significant improvement to the spacing between the buildings." Yes, for every neighbour and boundary except ours at No. 12! The report is extremely lacking in dealing with negative outcomes of the proposal.

3. Demolition

We have not received any details of the demolition plan. The existing dwelling is a very significant, double brick structure and the demolition will cause considerable dust and noise issues. What methods are proposed to contain these impacts?

4. Natural ground level

The natural ground level on the side of No. 10, along the boundary adjacent to No. 12 has been raised for much of that boundary, particularly towards the southern end of our adjoining boundary. The timber boundary fence is 'underground' on the side of No. 10 at many points, making the boundary fence a pseudo retaining wall, which it was not built to do. All the soil buildup along the whole of the boundary line between Nos. 10 and 12 (on the side of No. 10) needs to be removed so that the natural ground line (the very bottom of the boundary fence) is re-established.

5. Overshadowing

Given that the proposed building is now adjacent to our boundary and continues for much of that boundary length, our backyard will now suffer considerably more overshadowing.

6. Contaminated soil on site

As the existing owners of No. 10 are aware, the site leaches oil into our property and into the street after heavy rainfall. Photos are available of this oil seepage. It is believed that a large volume of heating oil was once buried on site several years ago and the seepage has not reduced over the years. It is expected that this oil seepage will continue for decades to come. It would be beneficial for the environment if the site of the initial oil 'dump' could be located after demolition has occurred, in the hope of fixing this source of site contamination.