

---

**Sent:** 13/06/2023 11:03:00 AM

**Subject:** FW: Site inspection replied under separate cover - DA2022/2210 - 2 Peronne pde, Allambie Heights Robert Hodge owner and resident of 2 Smith ave Allambie grhighs

---

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, June 12, 2023 5:05 PM

**To:** Planning Panels - Northern Beaches <PlanningPanels@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>; [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** DA2022/2210 - 2 Peronne pde, Allambie Heights Robert Hodge owner and resident of 2 Smith ave Allambie grhighs

Our concerns are

Visual privacy- Currently our back yard is 100% private surrounded by our garden and trees. With the large east facing picture window W9, which is not mentioned in the assessment report combined with higher W10 and the front deck, there will be no single place for privacy in our backyard and this gaze will enter directly into our full length rear facing kitchen and living room windows. This impact from full privacy to nil privacy will be huge in our enjoyable amenity of our property and be uncomfortable to live.

Improvement- Angled vane screening or frosted windows screening *away* from our yards and internal living areas would significantly reduce impact. Front deck screens angled *away* from our overlooked yard would help if deck needs to be there at all.

Landscaped open space- There is no significant deep rooted tall screening trees between the east and western properties to reduce visual mass impact. Earlier green landscaping was replaced by a noted non compliant deck. If this unauthorised full width deck was removed there is room for the swimming pool to be moved from front to rear where it fits with current building codes and is the normal building regulation. No other property in the area has a swimming pool with encumbent in the front yard.

From the assessment report 'The landscaped space does not comply with the numerical equivalent of 40%'. 'An unauthorised existing rear deck'...'created the inconsistency between the existing approved landscaped open space percentage and the actual existing amount on-site'.

It is noted by council that the approved Consent 92/47 originally approved 65.4m2 has been reduced to 12.1m2 during the occupation of current owners. This is an opportunity to return to closer to the council requirement for other landholders by relocating the pool to the former rear deck area and provide a better landscape green/built landscape ratio.

Improvement - Instead of leaving the deck there with 'without consent for existing unauthorised works' ie: no difference. Just remove the council recognised unauthorised rear deck, move the swimming pool to this vacant place. Then plant tall screening trees in the now vacant front yard when the incongruous pool was relocated. More front yard for native trees would give a harmonious front landscape similar to all other neighbours.

Prior consent history- Comment from responsible council officer, Mr Dean Pattalis- voluntarily offered (paraphrase)- 'Would this DA be acceptable if it were categorised as a new development...No it

wouldn't pass by today's standards'. This is an indicator of poor planning of the past being exacerbated by additional development of current times. When considering this DA, is this a reason to add to poor planning consideration of the past then further removal of trees lowering landscape /plot ratio standards. Instead of using the lowered bar set by the current status quo , the council could ensure greater green screening accoeding to its current standards .

Shading- No *certified* shading diagram was ever shown. The current shading diagram does not take into account the sghade from existing buildings suchb as our own which shades the sun from the east till close to mid day on June 21. then the 2 Peronne covers the shade of the yard inn the afternoon. Occupants are allowed 50% sunlight for a minimum of three hours on June 21. This will not occur. This will leave our living yard devoid of most sun making it uncofortbale , cold and unpleasant to enjoy natural occupation.

Please supply an accurate independent certified shading diagram.

Improvement - Lowering the roof height and using a shallower roof pitch won't affect the ammenity of the proposed DA but will give a reasonable legal length of sunlight entering our yard for enjoyment.

Building bulk- The DA assessment report states the existing building does not comply with existing setbacks on the east, front and rear sides. When a second storey is added to this non compliace , the effect is dramatically increased because it affects bulk and reduces sunshine.

The site is sloping. It is not 'generally flat'. The DA is uphill of our viewing windows which increases its visual impact and mass.

The new two storey bulk will totally eliminate our district and skyline view and our last remaining avenue iof direct sunshine. This outlook is most important to us and can be improved by reduction of height and tree planting between our buildings to reduce visual impact.

I wish to have a site inspection of our property on Tuesday 13/6/23 by the panel so they can see our entire yard will be overlooked. I was attending a critical emergency on the remote mid north coast so could not make appoinment on Friday. I respect your consideration with a site inspection as I understand you are already coming to the area.

Yours faithfully,

Robert Hodge

2 Smith ave, Allambie Heights

