From:	[redacted]
Sent:	27/01/2023 5:25:38 PM
To:	Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Cc:	[redacted]
Subject:	Re: DA 2022 2275 103 BYNYA ROAD, PALM BEACH NSW 2108 WRITTEN SUBMISSION: LETTER OF OBJECTION SUBMISSION: TULLOCH
Attachments:	103 BYNYA PB WS.pdf;

Could you replace the earlier submission [4.59pm] with this document please - typo on the address.

Kind regards,

Bill Tulloch BSc[Arch]BArch[Hons1]UNSW RIBA RAIA
[redacted]

On 27 Jan 2023, at 4:59 pm, [redacted] wrote:

Kind regards,

Bill Tulloch BSc[Arch]BArch[Hons1]UNSW RIBA RAIA
[redacted]

<103 BYNYA PB WS.pdf>

S U B M I S S I O N

a written submission by way of objection

Bill Tulloch BSc [Arch] BArch [Hons1] UNSW RIBA RAIA

prepared for

EUGENE & KIM BUFFA, 105 BYNYA ROAD, PALM BEACH NSW 2108

25 JANUARY, 2023

Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly
NSW 1655

council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

RE: DA 2022 2275
103 BYNYA ROAD, PALM BEACH NSW 2108
WRITTEN SUBMISSION: LETTER OF OBJECTION
SUBMISSION: TULLOCH

Dear Sir,

This document is a written submission by way of objection lodged under Section 4.15 of the EPAA 1979 [the EPA Act].

I have been instructed by my clients to prepare an objection to this DA.

Unless the Applicant submits Amended Plans to resolve all of the adverse amenity impacts raised within this Submission, my clients ask Council to REFUSE this DA.

CONTENTS

2. THE SITE

3. THE LOCALITY

4. STATUTORY CONTROLS

C. CONTENTIONS THAT THE APPLICATION BE REFUSED

    1. LACK OF STATUTORY POWER

    2. CONTRARY TO AIMS OF LEP

    3. CONTRARY TO ZONE OBJECTIVES

    4. INCORRECT CONSIDERATION OF 'GROUND LEVEL EXISTING'

    5. EXCESSIVE BUILDING HEIGHT

    6. EXCESSIVE WALL HEIGHT & NUMBER OF STOREY

    7. INADEQUATE CLAUSE 4.6 VARIATION REQUEST

    8. UNACCEPTABLE BUILDING SEPARATION

    9. BUILT FORM, BULK AND SCALE

    10. STORMWATER CONCERNS

    11. IMPACTS UPON ADJOINING PROPERTIES: VIEW LOSS

    12. IMPACTS UPON ADJOINING PROPERTIES: PRIVACY

    13. PRECEDENT

    14. PUBLIC INTEREST

D. CONTENTIONS THAT RELATE TO INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

E. REQUEST FOR AMENDED PLANS TO BE SUBMITTED TO BETTER ADDRESS IMPACTS UPON ADJOINING PROPERTIES

F. REASONS FOR REFUSAL

G. CONCLUSION

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The design of the dwelling does not ensure that the existing high levels of amenity to my clients' property is retained.

The proposal is considered to be inappropriate within the streetscape.

The subject site is zoned C4 Environmental Living under the LEP, and there is no reason, unique or otherwise why a fully compliant solution to LEP and DCP controls cannot be designed on the site.

The proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site and an unbalanced range of amenity impacts that result in adverse impacts on my clients' property.

- Visual Privacy
- Visual Bulk
- View loss

The proposed development fails to meet Council's planning controls, the objectives and the merit assessment provisions relating to:

- Building Height: Proposed 8.85m v Control 8.5m [4% non-compliance]
- Southern Side Boundary Envelope

The proposed development represents an unreasonably large dwelling house design, for which there are design alternatives to achieve a reasonable development outcome on the site without having such impacts.

The proposed development does not satisfy the objectives of the zone or contribute to a scale that is consistent with the desired character of the locality and the scale of surrounding development.

A compliant building design would reduce the amenity impacts identified.

My clients agree with Roseth SC in NSWLEC Pafbum v North Sydney Council:

"*People affected by a proposal have a legitimate expectation that the development on adjoining properties will comply with the planning regime.*"

The '*legitimate expectation'* that my clients had as a neighbour was for a development that would not result in very poor amenity outcomes caused directly from the non-compliance to building envelope controls.

My clients wish to emphasise the fact that my clients take no pleasure in objecting to their neighbour's DA.

The proposed DA has a deleterious impact on the amenity of their property caused by the DA being non-compliant to controls.

If the DA was fully or even substantially compliant to all development controls, they recognise that their rights with respect to any resulting amenity loss to their property would be more limited.

Council and NSWLEC Commissioners regularly concede that development standards and building envelopes provide for maximums and that there is no entitlement to achieve those maximums.

It does seem unreasonable that the Applicants wish to remove my client's amenity to improve their own, and is proposing non-compliant outcomes that would seriously adversely affect my clients' amenity.

The LEP does not include floor space ratio standards to control building bulk and scale in this residential area. Managing building bulk and scale relies on the application of controls relating to landscaped area, building height and building setbacks and building envelopes.

Council's development controls relating to managing building bulk and scale are designed to ensure that buildings are consistent with the height and scale of the desired character of the locality, are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development, respond sensitively to the natural topography and allow for reasonable sharing of views and visual amenity.

Council's DCP with respect to the locality, requires that development respond to the natural environment and minimise the bulk and scale of buildings. The proposed development in its current form does not achieve this and provides inadequate pervious landscaped area at ground level.

The proposal does not succeed when assessed against the Heads of Consideration pursuant to section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 as amended. It is considered that the application, does not succeed on merit and is not worthy of the granting of development consent.

The proposed development fails the fundamental principles of design excellence in terms of:

- Built form, scale

My clients ask Council to seek modifications to this DA as the proposed development does not comply with the planning regime, by non-compliance to development standards, and this non-compliance leads directly to my clients' amenity loss.

If any Amended Plan Submission is made by the Applicant, and re-notification is waived by Council, my clients ask Council to inform them immediately by email of those amended plans, so that my clients can inspect those drawings on the Council website.

B. FACTS

1. THE PROPOSAL

The development application seeks approval for the proposed demolition of the existing dwelling and construction of a new dwelling and swimming pool at 103 Bynya Road, Palm Beach.

2. THE SITE

The site is legally identified as Lot 8 within Deposited Plan 14630.

3. THE LOCALITY

The existing character of the local area, including the immediate visual catchment (generally within 150 metres of the site) is of a well-established neighbourhood, made up of a heterogeneous mix of dwelling types within domestic landscaped settings.

My clients' property shares a common boundary with the subject site.

4. STATUTORY CONTROLS

The following Environmental Planning Instruments and Development Control Plans are relevant to the assessment of this application:

- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000

- SEPP (Building Sustainability Index: BASIX) 2004;
- SEPP (Resilience and Hazards) 2021;
- SEPP (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021.

- Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014 [referred to as LEP in this Submission]
- Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan [referred to as DCP in this Submission]

C. CONTENTIONS THAT THE APPLICATION BE REFUSED

1. LACK OF STATUTORY POWER

CLAUSE 4.6

The development application should be refused as the proposal exceeds the development standard prescribed by the LEP and it has not been supported by a request to vary pursuant to clause 4.6 of the LEP.

2. CONTRARY TO AIMS OF LEP

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to satisfy the aims under the LEP.

3. CONTRARY TO ZONE OBJECTIVES

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to satisfy the objectives of the zone of *the LEP*.

4. INCORRECT CONSIDERATIONS OF 'GROUND LEVEL EXISTING'

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to present *ground level (existing)* in accordance with the LEP, and the recent decisions on *ground level (existing)* at the NSWLEC.

The LEP states the following within the LEP Dictionary:

"ground level (existing) means the existing level of a site at any point."

The DA drawings have not adequately transferred the spot levels from the Registered Surveyors drawing onto the DA Architectural drawings to allow assessment of heights.

The topography of the site shows that the site has falls across the site.

The manner in which building height is measured has been clarified in a recent judgement of the NSW Land and Environment Court. In accordance with the NSWLEC judgement for *Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2021] NSWLEC 1582, building height is measured from the existing ground level.

My clients bring to Council's attention recent NSWLEC decisions relating to the consideration of *ground level (existing)* on sites that had not been totally built upon:

- In *Strebora Pty Ltd v Randwick City Council (No. 2)* [2017] NSWLEC 1575 ('*Strebora*'),: Commissioner: Dickson: '*the determination of 'ground level (existing)' must bear some relationship to the overall topography and context of the site'*

- In *Gejo Pty Ltd v Canterbury-Bankstown Council* [2017] NSWLEC 1712('*Gejo*'): Commissioner Gray: '*actual height of the proposed building must first be determined by application of the [relevant] LEP definitions and that the extrapolation approach used in Bettar and Stamford was justified in circumstances where the existing ground level is not known due to extensive development on the site'*.

- In *Nicola v Waverley Council* [2020] NSWLEC 1599 ('*Nicola*'): Commissioner Bindon: '*where the facts and circumstances of the case make the use of the extrapolation method appropriate, the levels to be used should be taken from the closest immediate proximity where existing ground can be found, whether that be inside or outside subject site.*

- In Cadele Investments Pty Ltd v Randwick City Council [2021] NSWLEC 1484 at [90]-[91]: Commissioner Bindon stated: "the alternative method of measurement is not in accordance with the definition of building height in the RLEP, which relies on the defined term "ground level (existing)". In using the undefined "natural ground line" the Applicant relies on the concept of extrapolating the ground levels on the periphery of the site to avoid the inconvenient "variations to the landform created by the existing dwelling", and refers to Bettar v Council of the City of Sydney [2014] NSWLEC 1070 (Bettar) as providing an authority to do so.

My clients bring to Council's attention early NSWLEC decisions relating to the consideration of *ground level (existing)* on sites that had been wholly built upon:

- *Bettar v Council of the City of Sydney [2014] NSWLEC 1070*: Commissioner O'Neill. The *Bettar* extrapolation method

- Stamford Property Services Pty Ltd v City of Sydney [2015] NSWLEC 1189 ('Stamford'): Commissioner Pearson

Council will also note, that in October 2021, the Court decided not to apply Bettar in a particular case *Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council [2021] NSWLEC 1582*. The Court did not apply the Bettar decision and instead said (at [73]) that:

- *the existing level of the site at a point beneath the existing building is the level of the land at that point; and*

- *the 'ground level (existing)' within the footprint of the existing building is the existing excavated ground level on the site.*

My clients contend that *ground level (existing)* on the subject site has not been assessed correctly.

My clients bring to Council's attention the following issues.

The Registered Surveyors drawing shoes the lower level of the existing dwelling at RL 110.54. Allowing for a slab thickness, I contend *ground level (existing)* on the subject site under the highest part of the proposed development to be RL 110.30.

The proposed roof is at RL 119.15. This gives a HOB at 8.85m. No Clause 4.6 Variation has been submitted.

5. EXCESSIVE BUILDING HEIGHT

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to comply with the building height development standard under the LEP.

The proposed development should be refused due to its excessive height and failure to comply with the *Height of Buildings* set out in the LEP which permits a maximum height of 8.5 metres.

No written variation request under cl.4.6 of the LEP seeking to justify the contravention of the height of buildings development standard has been made having regard to the requirements of cl.4.6(3) and 4.6(4)(a)(i) of LEP.

The proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the Height of Buildings development standard pursuant to LEP.

- The development compromises private views and solar loss
- The development does not minimise visual impact
- The development is not compatible with the desired future character of the locality in terms of building height and roof form.
- The development does not minimise the adverse effects of the bulk and scale of buildings

The adverse impacts of the proposed development, including on the amenity of neighbouring property and public property, are directly attributable to the exceedance of the height of buildings development standard.

The proposal is inconsistent with the LEP as there is a public benefit in maintaining the Height of Buildings development standard in this particular case.

In respect of the proposed development, I submit that the built form, which also incorporates other substantial non-compliant breaches will have negative impacts the amenity of neighbours as well as have significant impacts in respect of visual intrusion. Additionally, there is nothing provided for in this development that seeks to minimise the adverse effects of bulk and scale of the building.

My clients contend that the proposal fails to adequately demonstrate that compliance with each standard is unreasonable or unnecessary nor that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening each of the standards. Variation of the development standards is not in the public interest because the proposed development is not consistent with the objectives of each development standard nor the objectives of the zone. The proposed development has not sought adequate variations to development standards. The proposal is excessive in bulk and scale, and is inconsistent with the desired future character of the area resulting in adverse impacts on the streetscape. The proposal results in an unacceptable dominance of built form over landscape. The proposal fails to minimise the adverse effects of bulk and scale resulting in adverse amenity impacts.

The proposed development should be refused due to its excessive visual impact and impacts on the character of the locality, adjoining properties and the surrounding environment.

The form and massing of the proposal does not appropriately respond to the low-density character of the surrounding locality

The form and massing of development is also inconsistent with the provisions of the DCP which prescribe that new development should complement the predominant building form in the locality.

The proposal would not recognise or protect the natural or visual environment of the area, or maintain a dominance of landscape over built form. The proposal has not been designed to minimise the visual impact on the surrounding environment.

In Veloshin, [Veloshin v Randwick Council 2007], NSW LEC considered Height, Bulk & Scale. Veloshin suggest that Council should consider:

"Are the impacts consistent with impacts that may be reasonably expected under the controls? For non-complying proposals the question cannot be answered unless the difference between the impacts of a complying and a non-complying development is quantified."

The impacts are not consistent with the impacts that would be reasonably expected under the controls.

In Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council (2005) NSW LEC 191, NSW LEC considered character:

"whether most observers would find the proposed development offensive, jarring or unsympathetic in a streetscape context, having regard to the built form characteristics of development within the site's visual catchment".

The non-compliant elements of the proposed development, particularly caused from non-compliant excessive heights would have most observers finding *'the proposed development offensive, jarring or unsympathetic'*.

6. EXCESSIVE WALL HEIGHT & NUMBER OF STOREY

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to comply with the control.

The proposed development should be refused due to its excessive height and failure to comply with the Wall Height set out in the controls.

The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives of the zone and the objectives that underpin the wall height.

This non-compliance, as well as the other non-compliances, arising from the proposed upper level indicates that the proposal cannot satisfactorily achieve the underlying objectives of this control, ultimately resulting in an unacceptable building bulk that creates a severe amenity impact.

- The development compromises private views and solar loss
- The development does not minimise visual impact
- The development is not compatible with the desired future character of the locality in terms of building height and roof form.
- The development does not minimise the adverse effects of the bulk and scale of buildings

The adverse impacts of the proposed development, including on the amenity of neighbouring property and public property, are directly attributable to the exceedance of the wall height control.

The failure of the SEE to demonstrate the outcomes required by the wall height control means that the variation cannot be supported and, therefore, by necessity, the development application should be refused.

The proposal is inconsistent with the LEP and DCP as there is a public benefit in maintaining the Wall Height control in this particular case.

The proposed portion of the building above the maximum wall height is not 'minor'.

My clients contend that the proposal fails to adequately demonstrate that compliance with each standard or control is unreasonable or unnecessary nor that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening each of the standards. Variation of the development standards or control is not in the public interest because the proposed development is not consistent with the objectives of each development standard or control nor the objectives of the zone. The proposed development has not sought adequate variations to development standards or controls. The proposal is excessive in bulk and scale, and is inconsistent with the desired future character of the area resulting in adverse impacts on the streetscape. The proposal results in an unacceptable dominance of built form over landscape. The proposal fails to minimise the adverse effects of bulk and scale resulting in adverse amenity impacts.

The non-compliant elements of the proposed development, particularly caused from non-compliant excessive heights would have most observers finding *'the proposed development offensive, jarring or unsympathetic'*.

7. INADEQUATE CLAUSE 4.6 VARIATION REQUEST

No Clause 4.6 Variation Request has been made.

In simple terms, I contend that:

- the impacts are not consistent with the impacts that may be reasonably expected under the controls;
- the proposal's height and bulk do not relate to the height and bulk desired under the relevant controls;
- the area has a predominant existing character and are the planning controls likely to maintain it;
- the proposal does not fit into the existing character of the area;
- the proposal is inconsistent with the bulk and character intended by the planning controls;
- the proposal looks inappropriate in its context

The objectives of the standard have not been met.

The bulk and scale of the proposed development is inappropriate for the site and locality.

Strict compliance with the maximum building height is reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case.

In summary, the proposal does not satisfy the requirements of clause 4.6 of LEP 2014.

The variation of the standard would not be in the public interest because it would set a precedent for development in the neighbourhood, such that successive exceedances would erode the views enjoyed from other similar properties.

The proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives of the standard and the objectives for development within the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out.

8. UNACCEPTABLE BUILDING SEPARATION

The proposed development should be refused as it is significantly non-compliant with setback of the DCP.

- Side Boundary Envelope

The proposed development does not provide appropriate setbacks. This leads to inconsistency with the character of the area and unreasonable amenity impacts.

The proposed development results in an encroachment beyond the prescribed building envelope. This non-compliance is indicative of an unacceptable built form and contributes to the severe amenity loss.

The proposal will result in an unsatisfactory scale of built form that will be disproportionate and unsuitable to the dimensions of the site and neighbouring residential development.

The height and bulk of the development will result in unreasonable impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring properties with regard to visual dominance.

The excessive built form of the proposal results in a development where the building mass becomes visually dominant and imposing, particularly when viewed from the visual catchment of neighbouring properties

The cumulative effect of the non-compliances with setback and other development standard result in an over development of the site with the site being not suitable for the scale and bulk of the proposal.

9. BUILT FORM, BULK AND SCALE

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it will have unacceptable impacts upon the amenity of neighbours' property, specifically with regard to visual bulk impact.

The development has excessive bulk and scale and fails to comply with development standards set out LEP, resulting in a building which has unacceptable adverse impacts on neighbouring properties and the locality.

The non-complaint building envelope will lead to unacceptable visual bulk impact to neighbours.

The multiple non-compliances arising from the proposed upper floor level indicates that the proposed development cannot achieve the underlying objectives of this control, resulting in an unacceptable building bulk when viewed from adjoining and nearby properties.

The development presents an inappropriate response to the site and an unsatisfactory response to the desired future character of the area.

As detailed above, a redesign of the proposed development is strongly recommended to improve the amenity of adjoining properties.

10. STORMWATER CONCERNS

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to provide adequate stormwater control outcomes.

My clients ask Council to consider the stormwater design and the OSD.

My clients ask Council to ensure that there are stormwater pits to collect surface and sub surface stormwater along the perimeter of the subject site.

11. IMPACTS UPON ADJOINING PROPERTIES: VIEW LOSS

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to achieve an appropriate view sharing outcome to neighbours.

The development results in a loss of private views enjoyed by the neighbouring properties.

The development does not satisfy the objectives and planning controls of the DCP in respect to view loss.

The development exceeds the maximum quantum of development for the site by contravening development standards and planning controls.

The reduction of private views enjoyed by the neighbouring properties is attributed to the breaches of statutory development standards and planning controls that regulate the building envelope.

The proposed scale and design are not considered to take into account site or area planning to protect available water views. The proposed height, design and roof form are not considered to promote or maximise the opportunity of achieving the *'reasonable sharing of views'* and some view access to be maintained for neighbours. It is considered that design options do exist, in terms of '*innovative design solutions'* to improve the urban environment, including maintaining view access in the area and tapering built form with the sloping topography. The application does not detail whether or which 'skilful' design options have been considered in accordance with the Planning Principle established by the Land and Environment Court in *Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council* (2004) NSWLEC 140. The principle seeks to achieve a development whilst allowing reasonable view access. The available information does not provide current height poles or a view montage to clearly quantity the views blocked or protected by the current design. At a reduced height, with a lower roof form, the building could potentially allow some view across. It is considered reasonable to request a revised design in order to protect the public interest.

Height poles are to be erected and are to be certified by a registered surveyor.

View impact photographs are to be taken from my client's property and public places.

View impact photomontages prepared in accordance with the Land and Environment Court policy on the use of photomontages are to be prepared from the view impact photographs.

I consider that my clients' view loss is greater than moderate. My clients' loss is best defined as moderate.

For proposed developments where there is the potential for view loss from nearby or adjoining properties, consideration must be given to the view sharing principles detailed in the judgement handed down by the NSW Land and Environment Court under *Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council.*

In relation to principle four of this judgement (being the 'assessment of the reasonableness of the proposal that is causing the impact'), it is considered that a development which complies with all planning controls would be deemed more reasonable than one that is non-compliant. The proposal, as it currently stands, presents numerous non-compliances to the planning controls listed under the LEP and DCP. This brings into question as to whether a more 'skilful' (or sensitive) design would achieve an improved and acceptable outcome, and as such allowing for an acceptable level of view sharing.

In this instance, it must be strongly recommended that the proposed upper floor is redesigned to respond to, and address, principle four of *Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council*, which would provide the Applicant with a similar amenity while also reducing the view impact to an acceptable level on adjoining properties. An alternative design outcome could be achieved involving a reduction to the internal floor space of the proposed upper level.

In this instance, alternative design outcomes are encouraged to appropriately and satisfactorily address the four-part assessment of *Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council*.

The proposed development when considered against the DCP and the NSW Land and Environment Court Planning Principle in *Tenacity Consulting Pty Ltd v Warringah Council (2004) NSWLEC* will result in an unacceptable view impact and will not achieve appropriate view sharing.

The proposed development will result in unacceptable additional view impacts. The view impact is greater than moderate when considered against the *Tenacity* planning principle. The view impact could reasonably be avoided by a more considered design that retains the amenity of the proposal, whilst limiting the impact upon the neighbouring property.

The built form proposed blocks scenic, iconic or highly valued items or whole views as defined in *Tenacity* terms.

The proposed development will unreasonably obstruct views enjoyed by my clients' property from highly used rooms and from entertainment balconies, resulting in inconsistency with the requirements and objectives of the DCP.

The proposed development has not considered the strategic placement of canopy trees to avoid further view loss impacts upon existing view corridors.

The Applicant has not provided an adequate View Impact Analysis which details the extent to which existing water views from my clients' property, and other impacted dwellings, are obstructed under the current proposal. The existing documentation accompanying the application is insufficient to undertake a detailed analysis of the proposal against the relevant DCP and NSWLEC guidelines.

The proposal may also cause potential view loss of the water views from the public road, and may cause potential view loss from other neighbours who have not been notified of this DA.

The SEE has not considered the loss of street view loss from the public domain. The impact on public domain views has not been assessed by the applicant. I refer to Rose Bay Marina Pty Limited v Woollahra Municipal Council 2013 NSWLEC 1046. My clients contend that the public domain street view will be completely lost.

I bring to Council's attention a number of recent decisions on view loss grounds:

- FURLONG V NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL [2022] NSWLEC 1208 [NSWLEC Dismissal of Appeal]
- DER SARKISSIAN V NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL [2021] NSWLEC 1041[NSWLEC Dismissal of Appeal]
- WENLI WANG V NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL [2018] NSWLEC 122
- REBEL MH NEUTRAL BAY PTY LTD V NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL [2018] NSWLEC 191
- AHEARNE V MOSMAN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL [2023] NSWLEC 1013

I contend that the composite consideration from these NSWLEC decisions, gives clear consideration that where view loss occurs across a side boundary caused by non-complaint development, and the view loss is moderate or higher, then the DA is unreasonable.

Other decisions suggest that even when a compliant development causes view loss, and the view is across a side boundary, and when there is an alternative option open to avoid that view loss, and that alternative has not been taken, then the DA is unreasonable.

FURLONG V NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL [2022] NSWLEC 1208

I refer to a dismissal of a Class 1 Appeal by NSWLEC Commissioner Dr Peter Walsh on a nearby site in Dee Why on view loss grounds. I refer to Furlong v Northern Beaches Council [2022] NSWLEC 1208. [NBC DA 2021/0571, 55 Wheeler Parade Dee Why]

I raise the dismissal by NSWLEC of the Applicant's appeal. The case in question had many similarities to this DA.

NBC DDP refused this DA on 24 November 2021, with Panel members Rod Piggott, Rebecca Englund, Tony Collier and Liza Cordoba, following a Refusal Recommendation of NBC Development Assessment Manager, by the NBC Responsible Officer Jordan Davies, a very senior NBC Planning Officer, that Council as the consent authority refuses Development Consent to DA2021/0517 for Alterations and additions to a dwelling house on land at Lot B DP 338618, 55 Wheeler Parade Dee Why subject to the conditions that were outlined in the Assessment Report.

The assessment of DA 2020/0517 involved a consideration of a view loss arising from a proposed development that presented a generally compliant envelope to LEP and DCP controls.

The DDP agreed with the recommendation and refused this DA.

The Assessment Report found that:

" A view assessment is undertaken later in this assessment report and the proposal is found to result in an unsatisfactory view sharing outcome and the application is recommended for refusal for this reason"

The Assessment Report found that in respect to a compliant envelope:

" the question to be answered is whether a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact upon views of neighbours."

The Assessment Report within the Tenacity Assessment concluded:

"the view impact looking south-east is considered both severe and devastating from the respective rooms given the significant proportion of the views which are impacted. The aspect looking south and south- east are considered whole, prominent coastal views which are certainly worthy of consideration and at least partial protection. The proposal to remove the vast majority of these views is considered overall to be a severe view impact."

The DA was recommended for refusal, and DDP refused the DA in full support of the NBC Responsible Officer Assessment Report.

The severity of the view loss that was considered unacceptable by the DDP was clearly stated by the DDP. This level of view loss was considered as '*severe*' by the assessing officers and the DDP.

The Applicant appealed this decision.

On 22 April 2022, the appeal on Furlong v Northern Beaches Council [2022] NSWLEC 1208, was dismissed by the NSWLEC Commissioner Dr Peter Walsh. The decision summarised the issues:

60 Council took me to the findings of Robson J in Wenli Wang v North Sydney Council [2018] NSWLEC 122 ('Wenli Wang').

I reproduce pars [70]-[71] below:

"70 Applying the fourth step of Tenacity, I repeat that the proposed development complies with the development standards in the LEP and is therefore more reasonable than a development which would have breached them. However, I do also note that there is evidence in the form of the Colville plan that a similar amount of floor space could be provided by a design which reduces the effect on the view from the surrounding properties.

71 I consider there is force in the submission of Council that the applicant has taken a circular approach to the fourth step of Tenacity which presupposes a right to the level of amenity achieved by the proposed development. Whilst it is true that a redevelopment similar to that provided in the Colville plan would not provide the same amenity as the proposed development, it would provide a very high level of amenity and enjoy impressive views."

61 In the matter before me, I am more inclined to the kind of conclusion expressed at [71] in Wenli Wang. While the proposed development, accommodating the alternative designs suggested by Council (either shifting the master bedroom westwards some 3.5m or sliding the master bedroom to the south to bring about the same view availability effect – see [43]), may not provide the same amenity outcomes as would be the case without such changes, the proposal would still enjoy a very high level of amenity, including in regard to the panoramic views available to the south, especially from living areas. The master bedroom would still enjoy superior views.

62 The proposal would bring about a severe view loss impact on 51A Wheeler Parade when there are reasonable design alternatives which would moderate this impact significantly. The proposal does not pay sufficient regard to cl D7 of WDCP which requires view sharing. The proposal before the Court does warrant the grant of consent in the circumstances.

The key issues in this case considered that the proposal would bring about a greater than moderate view loss impact, across a side boundary, on a Study/Bedroom when there was a reasonable design alternative which would moderate this impact significantly. The proposal did not pay sufficient regard to cl D7 of WDCP which requires view sharing.



The NSWLEC Furlong View Loss

DER SARKISSIAN V NORTHERN BEACHES COUNCIL [2021] NSWLEC 1041

My clients refer to a dismissal of a Class 1 Appeal by NSWLEC Commissioner Dr Peter Walsh on a nearby site in Curl Curl on view loss grounds. My clients refer to Der Sarkissian v Northern Beaches Council [2021] NSWLEC 1041. [NBC DA 2019/0380, 72 Carrington Parade, Curl Curl]

I raise the dismissal by NSWLEC of the Applicant's appeal. The case in question had many similarities to this DA.

- The main view loss concern was to a neighbour immediately behind 72 Carrington Parade, Curl Curl. My clients are in a similar position immediately behind the subject site.
- The view loss involved side setback controls.
- The view loss at Curl Curl was severe – my clients' loss would be also be greater than moderate: my clients would have significant loss of land/water interface from my clients' living spaces

The key matters within the Commissioner's Conclusion:

- the determinative issue in this case is view loss
- the proposal would significantly change the amenity enjoyed for the worse.

- both policy controls and view sharing principles suggest the proposal goes too far.
- proposal attempts to achieves too much on a constrained site.
- a reasonable development at the upper level in regard to view sharing and setback policy,
- with good design, there is scope for this to occur while also providing for reasonable floor space on this level.

It is clear that the view loss, on this DA, occurs through a poor consideration on wall height, building height and side boundary envelope controls.

My commentary on this DA is very similar to Commissioner Walsh in Der Sarkissian v Northern Beaches Council [2021] NSWLEC 1041

- the determining issue in this case is view loss – in my clients' case a water and water/land interface view loss
- the proposal would significantly change the amenity enjoyed for the worse.
- policy controls of building height, wall height, side boundary envelope non-compliances and view sharing principles suggest the proposal goes too far.
- proposal attempts to achieves too much on a constrained site.
- a reasonable development at the upper level in regard to view sharing building height, wall height, side boundary envelope policy, would share the view
- with good design, there is scope for view sharing to occur while also providing for reasonable floor space on all levels

My clients contend that there is no reasonable sharing of views amongst dwellings.

The new development is not designed to achieve a reasonable sharing of views available from surrounding and nearby properties.

The proposal has not demonstrated that view sharing is achieved through the application of the Land and Environment Court's planning principles for view sharing.

WENLI WANG V NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL [2018] NSWLEC 122

This decision, and referenced in FURLONG, gives consideration to the assessment of a complaint development.

In this particular case, Council is assessing a substantially non-complaint development, however view loss over a side boundary again is a key matter,

REBEL MH NEUTRAL BAY PTY LTD V NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL [2018] NSWLEC 191

As noted by his Honour, Justice Moore of the Court in Rebel MH Neutral Bay Pty Ltd v North Sydney Council [2018] NSWLEC 191 (Rebel),

"the concept of sharing of views does not mean, for the reasons earlier explained, the creation of expansive and attractive views for a new development at the expense of removal of portion of a pleasant outlook from an existing development. This cannot be regarded as "sharing" for the purposes of justifying the permitting of a non-compliant development when the impact of a compliant development would significantly moderate the impact on a potentially affected view".

This is a key consideration, and one that parallels the forementioned NSWLEC decisions.

AHEARNE V MOSMAN MUNICIPAL COUNCIL [2023] NSWLEC 1013

As noted by Commissioner Espinosa of the Court in Ahearne v Mosman Municipal Council [2023] NSWLEC 1013 that the view sharing objectives and controls were minimised through the appropriate distribution of floor space and landscaping.

The importance of this decision reinforces the issues of landscaping in view loss assessment, and the consideration that the composite outcome of appropriate distribution of floor space and landscaping is relevant to view sharing principles.

NBC RECENT REFUSALS ON VIEW LOSS

I raise refusals by NBC DDP and NBLPP in 2022, on view loss grounds:

- NBLPP REFUSAL: DA 2021/1408 16 ADDISON ROAD MANLY
- NBC DDP REFUSAL: DA 2021/1734; 21 HEADLAND ROAD NORTH CURL CURL.
- NBLPP REFUSAL: DA 2022/0625 27 KARLOO PARADE NEWPORT
- NBLPP REFUSAL: DA 2022/1158 13 ILUKA ROAD, PALM BEACH

NBLPP REFUSAL: DA2021/1408 16 ADDISON ROAD MANLY

On 16 March 2022, NBLPP refused DA2021/1408 at 16 Addison Road Manly, accepting the Assessment Report of NBC Officer Maxwell Duncan. NBLPP Members were Crofts, Sainsbury, Krason and Cotton. The DA was refused as the proposed development was inconsistent with the provisions of Clause 3.4.3 Maintenance of Views of the Manly Development Control Plan.

The view loss was <u>across side boundaries.</u>

Comment to Principle 4:

The proposed development complies with the Building Height and Floor Space Ratio development standards under the Manly LEP. The subject development does not comply with the controls of the MDCP 2013 and, in the circumstance, it is found that the view loss for the neighbouring property is unacceptable and warrants the refusal

of the application. The demonstrated non-compliances, being side setbacks and wall height give rise to unreasonable view impacts. It is acknowledged that the context and siting of the existing dwelling on the subject site, makes views for adjoining properties extremely vulnerable to any form of new development. However, it is concluded that the extent of the breaches of the planning controls is excessive and a more skilful and compliant design would vastly improve the outcome. The question of a more skilful design has been considered in that a close analysis of the plans identifies the opportunity to retain areas of view lines from all affected properties. The views assessment determined that there is the opportunity to significantly lessen the impact on views. While it acknowledged that that full compliance would be unreasonable given the constraints of the site, a greater level of compliance with both the wall height and side setback control would allow for view corridors to be maintained. In this regard, the development potential would not be significantly compromised. Therefore, the proposed dwelling house in particular the first-floor setback and wall height non-compliance is considered unreasonable in the circumstances of this application in that the application does not demonstrate a reasonable sharing of views.

In general terms, NBLPP assessed that the proposed development was unreasonable, in that the minor non-compliance to the side setbacks and wall height contributed to the view loss, and therefore was unreasonable. Although the proposed development complied with HOB and FSR, NBLPP considered that a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours to bring about impact.

NBC DDP REFUSAL: DA 2021/1734; 21 HEADLAND ROAD NORTH CURL CURL.

On 14 September 2022, NBC DDP refused DA 2021 1734 at 21 Headland Road North Curl Curl. Officer Richter [Independent Planning Consultant] recommended refusal on view loss grounds. The Panel Members were Adam Richardson, Anne-Maree Newbery and Neil Cocks.

The proposed development was compliant to HOB at 8.16m, with a modest non-compliance to Side Boundary Envelope.

The view loss was a modest triangular ocean south towards Manly, <u>across a front and rear boundary.</u>

The view loss however was devastating – a complete loss.

The DDP Refusal noted the following:

'The proposed scale and design are not considered to take into account site or area planning to protect available water views. The proposed height, design and roof form are not considered to promote or maximise the opportunity of achieving the 'reasonable sharing of views' and some view access to be maintained for the first floor areas of No. 20 Headland Road. It is considered that design options may exist, in terms of 'innovative design solutions' to improve the urban environment (including maintaining view access in the area and tapering built form with the

sloping topography). The application does not detail whether or which 'skilful' design options have been considered in accordance with the Planning Principle established by the Land and Environment Court in Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council (2004) NSWLEC 140. The principle seeks to achieve a development whilst allowing reasonable view access. The available information does not provide current height poles or a view montage to clearly quantity the views blocked or protected by the current design. At a reduced height, with a flatter roof form, the building could potentially allow some view across. It is considered reasonable to request a revised design in order to protect the public interest.'

In general terms, NBC DDP assessed that the proposed development was unreasonable, in that the minor non-compliance to side boundary envelope and minor non-compliance to wall height contributed to the view loss, and therefore was unreasonable. Although the proposed development complied with HOB, NBC DDP considered that a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours to bring about impact.

NBLPP REFUSAL: DA2022/0625 27 KARLOO PARADE NEWPORT

On 7 December 2022, NBLPP refused DA 2022/1158 on view loss grounds, across a side boundary. A recommendation for refusal on view loss grounds was presented by NBC Officer, Steven Findlay. NBLPP Members were Biscoe, Esposito, Brown and Simmons.

The view loss was severe.

The view in question was a partial view, across a side boundary to the headland view in Newport.

The loss was predominantly caused by a non-compliant HOB, Landscape Area, Side Boundary Envelope, and Setback controls.

The assessment read:

The view impacts are almost entirely caused by non- compliances which, independently when measured against the respective Outcomes in the P21DCP and PLEP. In response to Principle 4 - the design of the building is unreasonable and it is a non-compliance that is causing the view impacts. The site has ample opportunity to accommodate an alternate, more skilful design, which retains more views. The development is therefore inconsistent with the View Sharing Planning Principle of Tenacity Consulting Pty Ltd Vs Warringah Council (2004) NSWLEC 140.

In general terms, NBLPP assessed that the proposed development was unreasonable, in that the loss was predominantly caused by a non-compliant HOB, Landscape Area, Side Boundary Envelope, and Setback controls.

NBLPP REFUSAL: DA 2022/1158 13 ILUKA ROAD, PALM BEACH

On 14 December 2022, NBLPP refused DA 2022/1158 on view loss grounds, across a side boundary. A recommendation for refusal on view loss grounds was presented by NBC Officer Peter Robinson. NBLPP Members were Biscoe, Krason, Hussey and Bush.

The view in question was a partial view, across a side and secondary street boundary, across a reserve to the water view in Pittwater. The Assessment Report considered that 50% of the water view would be lost, and considered it a moderate loss. The loss was predominantly caused by a non-compliant secondary front building line. Although the proposed development was compliant to HOB, and most other envelope controls, it was the non-compliant secondary front building line that caused the moderate view loss that was considered unreasonable.

In general terms, NBLPP assessed that the proposed development was unreasonable, in that the minor non-compliance to the secondary front building line contributed to the view loss, and therefore was unreasonable. Although the proposed development complied with HOB, NBLPP considered that a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours to bring about impact.

TENACITY CONSULTING V WARRINGAH COUNCIL 2004

In Tenacity, [Tenacity Consulting v Warringah Council 2004], NSW LEC considered Views. Tenacity suggest that Council should consider:

"A development that complies with all planning controls would be considered more reasonable than one that breaches them. Where an impact on views arises as a result of non-compliance with one or more planning controls, even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable."

The development breaches multiple planning controls and is unreasonable.

My clients contend that the impact on views arises as a result of non-compliance with one or more planning controls, and the view loss from the highly used rooms and decks is considered unreasonable.

APPLICATION OF TENACITY PLANNING PRINCIPLE

I have been unable to consider the impact of the proposal on the outward private domain views from my clients' property.

Height poles and montage view loss analysis has yet to be provided by the Applicant.

An assessment in relation to the planning principle of Roseth SC of the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales in Tenacity Consulting v Warringah [2004] NSWLEC 140 - Principles of view sharing: the impact on neighbours (Tenacity) is made, on a provisional basis ahead of height poles being erected by the Applicant.

The steps in Tenacity are sequential and conditional in some cases, meaning that

proceeding to further steps may not be required if the conditions for satisfying the preceding threshold is not met.

STEP 1 VIEWS TO BE AFFECTED

The first step quoted from the judgement in Tenacity is as follows:

The first step is the assessment of views to be affected. Water views are valued more highly than land views. Iconic views (eg of the Opera House, the Harbour Bridge or North Head) are valued more highly than views without icons. Whole views are valued more highly than partial views, eg a water view in which the interface between land and water is visible is more valuable than one in which it is obscured.

An arc of view is available when standing at a central location in the highly used zones including entertainment decks, highly used rooms, and private open spaces on my clients' property.

The composition of the arc is constrained over the subject site boundaries, by built forms and landscape. The central part of the composition includes the subject site. Views include scenic and valued features as defined in Tenacity. The proposed development will take away views for its own benefit. The view is from my clients' highly used rooms towards the view. The extent of view loss exceeds moderate and the features lost are considered to be valued as identified in Step 1 of Tenacity.

STEP 2: FROM WHERE ARE VIEWS AVAILABLE

This step considers from where the affected views are available in relation to the orientation of the building to its land and to the view in question. The second step, quoted, is as follows:

The second step is to consider from what part of the property the views are obtained. For example, the protection of views across side boundaries is more difficult than the protection of views from front and rear boundaries. In addition, whether the view is enjoyed from a standing or sitting position may also be relevant. Sitting views are more difficult to protect than standing views. The expectation to retain side views and sitting views is often unrealistic.

The views in all cases are available across the boundary of the subject site, from standing and seated positions. An arc of view is available when standing at highly used zones on my clients' property.

In this respect, I make two points: My clients have no readily obtainable mechanism to reinstate the impacted views from my clients' high used zones if the development as proposed proceeds; and all of the properties in the locality rely on views over adjacent buildings for their outlook, aspect and views.

STEP 3: EXTENT OF IMPACT

The next step in the principle is to assess the extent of impact and the locations from which the view loss occurs.

Step 3 as quoted is:

The third step is to assess the extent of the impact. This should be done for the whole of the property, not just for the view that is affected. The impact on views from living areas is more significant than from bedrooms or service areas (though views from kitchens are highly valued because people spend so much time in them). The impact may be assessed quantitatively, but in many cases this can be meaningless. For example, it is unhelpful to say that the view loss is 20% if it includes one of the sails of the Opera House. It is usually more useful to assess the view loss qualitatively as negligible, minor, moderate, severe or devastating.

As I rate the extent of view loss is above moderate in my opinion the threshold to proceed to Step 4 of Tenacity is met.

STEP 4: REASONABLENESS

The planning principle states that consideration should be given to the causes of the visual impact and whether they are reasonable in the circumstances.

Step 4 is quoted below:

The fourth step is to assess the reasonableness of the proposal that is causing the impact. A development that complies with all planning controls would be considered more reasonable than one that breaches them. Where an impact on views arises as a result of non-compliance with one or more planning controls, even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable. With a complying proposal, the question should be asked whether a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours. If the answer to that question is no, then the view impact of a complying development would probably be considered acceptable and the view sharing reasonable.

NSWLEC Commissioner Walsh in Balestriere v Council of the City of Ryde [2021] NSWLEC 1600 in relation to the Fourth Step:

There are three different points to the fourth Tenacity step, concerned with assessing the reasonableness of the impact, which I summarise as follows:

Point 1 - Compliance, or otherwise, with planning controls.

Point 2 - If there is a non-compliance, then even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable.

Point 3 - For complying proposals: (a) "whether a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours to bring about impact", and (b) "if the answer to

that question is no, then the view impact of a complying development would probably be considered acceptable and the view sharing reasonable".

In respect to Point 3, NSWLEC Commissioner Walsh in Furlong v Northern Beaches Council [2022] NSWLEC 1208 referenced *Wenli Wang v North Sydney Council* [2018] NSWLEC 122, in considering that if a more skilful design could be achieved arriving at an outcome that achieved '*a very high level of amenity and enjoy impressive views', then a proposed development has gone too far, and must be refused.*

As the proposed development does not comply with outcomes and controls, that are the most relevant to visual impacts, greater weight would be attributed to the effects caused.

In my opinion the extent of view loss considered to be the greater than moderate, in relation to the views from my clients' highly used zones of my clients' dwelling. The view is from a location from which it would be reasonable to expect that the existing view, particularly of the view that could be retained especially in the context of a development that does not comply with outcomes and controls. The private domain visual catchment is an arc from which views will be affected as a result of the construction of the proposed development. The proposed development will create view loss in relation to my clients' property. The views most affected are from my clients' highly used zones and include very high scenic and highly valued features as defined in Tenacity. Having applied the tests in the Tenacity planning principle I conclude that my clients would be exposed to a loss greater than moderate from the highly used rooms. The non-compliance with planning outcomes and controls of the proposed development will contribute to this loss. Having considered the visual effects of the proposed development envelope, the extent of view loss caused would be unreasonable and unacceptable.

The proposed development cannot be supported on visual impacts grounds. The proposal incorporates a significant departure from controls, which helps contain building envelope. Additionally, the siting of the proposed development and its distribution of bulk does not assist in achieving view sharing objectives. Where the diminishing of private views can be attributed to a non-compliance with one or more planning controls, even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable. My assessment finds that view sharing objectives have not been satisfied.

The above non-compliance will give rise to unreasonable amenity impacts upon the adjoining properties. In this instance, the proposal is not considered to achieve compliance with this control.

There are architectural solutions that maintains my clients' view. I identify the precise amendments necessary to overcome this loss.

As noted by his Honour, Justice Moore of the Court in Rebel MH Neutral Bay Pty Ltd v North Sydney Council [2018] NSWLEC 191 (Rebel),

"the concept of sharing of views does not mean, for the reasons earlier explained, the creation of expansive and attractive views for a new development at the expense of removal of portion of a pleasant outlook from an existing development.

This cannot be regarded as "sharing" for the purposes of justifying the permitting of a non-compliant development when the impact of a compliant development would significantly moderate the impact on a potentially affected view".

The same unreasonable scenario in Rebel applies to the current DA. The proposed breaching dwelling will take away views from my clients' property (and possibly other adjoining properties) to the considerable benefit of the future occupants of the proposed dwelling. This scenario is not consistent with the principle of View Sharing enunciated by his Honour, Justice Moore in Rebel. The adverse View Loss from my clients' property is one of the negative environmental consequences of the proposed development. The proposed development cannot be supported on visual impacts grounds.

These issues warrant refusal of the DA.

My clients ask Council to request that the Applicant position 'Height Poles/Templates' to define the non-compliant building envelope, and to have these poles properly measured by the Applicant's Registered Surveyor. The Height Poles will need to define: All Roof Forms, and all items on the roof, Extent of all Decks, Extent of Privacy Screens. Height Poles required for all trees. The Applicant will have to identify what heights and dimensions are proposed as many are missing from the submitted DA drawings.

In conclusion, as the dwelling proposed will impact views from my clients' property, the erection of height poles is required to allow an accurate assessment of view impact. The height poles should provide a delineation to identify any elements of the proposed built form that breaches the envelope controls of height and setbacks.

My clients contend that the proposed development when considered against the DCP and the NSW Land and Environment Court Planning Principle in *Tenacity Consulting Pty Ltd v Warringah Council (2004) NSWLEC* will result in an unacceptable view impact and will not achieve appropriate view sharing.

My clients contend that the proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* in that it does not satisfy the view sharing controls of the DCP.

12. IMPACTS UPON ADJOINING PROPERTIES: PRIVACY

The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it will have unacceptable impacts upon the amenity of neighbours' property, specifically with regard to visual privacy.

The proposed development should be refused as it will have unacceptable impacts upon the amenity of my clients' property, specifically with regard to visual privacy.

The proposed development will result in unacceptable overlooking of the adjoining dwelling and associated private open space, resulting in inconsistency with the provisions of the DCP and the objectives of the DCP.



There are a number of privacy concerns:

A. The proposed deck at the upper level has no privacy screens. We ask for a 1.6m high privacy screen;
B. The large glass windows will look immediately and directly into our windows. We ask for a sill level at 1.6m, and the remainder of the glass to be fixed and obscured;
C. The full height privacy screen will remove view. We ask for a reduction to 1.6m above FFL;
D. The raised deck has no privacy screen. We ask for a 1.6m high privacy screen;
E. The raised walkway will enable residents to look over the dividing fence. We ask for the side path to follow the existing levels.

The Applicant has not provided an adequate Privacy Impact Analysis which details the extent to which privacy at my clients' property will be adversely impacted by the proposal.

An assessment of the privacy impact against the planning principle Meriton v Sydney City Council [2004] NSWLEC 313 follows:

Principle 1: The ease with which privacy can be protected is inversely proportional to the density of development. At low-densities there is a reasonable expectation that

a dwelling and some of its private open space will remain private. At high-densities it is more difficult to protect privacy.

Response: The development is located in a low-density area.

Principle 2: Privacy can be achieved by separation. The required distance depends upon density and whether windows are at the same level and directly facing each other. Privacy is hardest to achieve in developments that face each other at the same level. Even in high-density development it is unacceptable to have windows at the same level close to each other. Conversely, in a low-density area, the objective should be to achieve separation between windows that exceed the numerical standards above. (Objectives are, of course, not always achievable.)

Response: The proposed development results in a privacy impact with the proposed windows facing neighbours without sufficient screening devices being provided, considering the proposed windows are directly opposite my clients' windows and balconies.

Principle 3: The use of a space determines the importance of its privacy. Within a dwelling, the privacy of living areas, including kitchens, is more important than that of bedrooms. Conversely, overlooking from a living area is more objectionable than overlooking from a bedroom where people tend to spend less waking time.

Response: The windows in question are windows of the main circulation zones and living areas, it is considered that the living areas will result in an unacceptable privacy breach. The proposed windows and decks facing the rear private open spaces for the neighbouring dwelling and will result in an unacceptable level of privacy impact.

Principle 4: Overlooking of neighbours that arises out of poor design is not acceptable. A poor design is demonstrated where an alternative design, that provides the same amenity to the applicant at no additional cost, has a reduced impact on privacy.

Response: The proposed development is a new development and the proposed windows have been designed without any consideration to the privacy of the neighbouring property.

Principle 5: Where the whole or most of a private open space cannot be protected from overlooking, the part adjoining the living area of a dwelling should be given the highest level of protection.

Response: It is considered that the private open space of the neighbouring dwellings could be better protected. My clients ask Council to consider the most appropriate privacy screening measures to be imposed on windows and decks facing my clients' property, including landscaping

Principle 6: Apart from adequate separation, the most effective way to protect privacy is by the skewed arrangement of windows and the use of devices such as

fixed louvres, high and/or deep sills and planter boxes. The use of obscure glass and privacy screens, while sometimes being the only solution, is less desirable.

Response: As mentioned above, the use of privacy devices would reduce the impact of the dwelling.

Principle 7: Landscaping should not be relied on as the sole protection against overlooking. While existing dense vegetation within a development is valuable, planting proposed in a landscaping plan should be given little weight.

Response: Additional landscaping may assist in additional to privacy devices.

Principle 8: In areas undergoing change, the impact on what is likely to be built on adjoining sites, as well as the existing development, should be considered.

Response: The area is not undergoing change that would warrant privacy impact such as the one presented.

Comment: As the development is considered to result in an unacceptable privacy impact due to the design, it is requested that the proposed development be redesigned to reduce amenity impact on the neighbouring properties.

In the context of the above principles, the application can be considered to violate the reasonable expectation that the habitable rooms and private open space at my clients' property will remain private. It is therefore reasonably anticipated that the application does not comply with the DCP.

The above non-compliance will give rise to unreasonable amenity impacts upon the adjoining properties. In this instance, the proposal is not considered to achieve compliance with this control.

13. PRECEDENT

The Development Application should be refused because approval of the proposal will create an undesirable precedent for similar inappropriate development in the area.

14. PUBLIC INTEREST

The proposal is contrary to the public interest pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. The proposed development is not in the public interest as the development is inconsistent with the scale and intensity of development that the community can reasonably expect to be provided on this site by nature of the applicable controls. The development does not represent orderly development of appropriate bulk, scale or amenity impact in the locality and approval of such a development would be prejudicial to local present and future amenity as well as desired future character and therefore is not in the public interest.

D. CONTENTIONS THAT RELATE TO INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

View Impact Analysis

The Applicant has not provided an adequate View Impact Analysis which details the extent to which existing water views from my clients' property are obstructed under the current proposal, from the proposed built form and the proposed trees, to accord with DCP controls and NSWLEC planning principles

My clients ask Council that after amended plans are submitted to reduce the building envelope below building height, wall height, and all envelope controls, to request that the Applicant position 'Height Poles/Templates' to define the non-compliant building envelope, and to have these poles properly measured by the Applicant's Registered Surveyor. The Height Poles will need to define: All Roof Forms, and all items on the roof, Extent of all Decks, Extent of Privacy Screens. Height Poles required for all trees. The Applicant will have to identify what heights and dimensions are proposed as many are missing from the submitted DA drawings.

Privacy Impact Analysis

The Applicant has not provided an adequate Privacy Impact Analysis, to accord with DCP controls and NSWLEC planning principles.

Visual Bulk Analysis

The Applicant has not provided adequate montages from my clients' property to assess the visual bulk assessment from the proposed non-compliant envelope.

Geotechnical Report

No report has been submitted.

E. REQUEST FOR AMENDED PLANS TO BE SUBMITTED TO BETTER ADDRESS IMPACTS UPON ADJOINING PROPERTIES

A compliant building design would reduce the amenity impacts identified.

Prepare and submit further supporting information and amendments to the assessing officer directly addressing the issues.

Reduce the proposed development as follow:

1. REDUCTION OF BUILT FORM

- Reduce the Building Height to 8.5m
- Delete all built from within Side Boundary Envelope or Inclined Plane zone
- Reduce built form to better share the view

2. PRIVACY DEVICES

- The proposed deck at the upper level has no privacy screens. We ask for a 1.6m high privacy screen. Privacy Screens to be shall be of fixed panels or battens or louver style construction (with a maximum spacing of 20mm), in materials that complement the design of the approved development;
- The large glass windows will look immediately and directly into our windows. We ask for a sill level at 1.6m, and the remainder of the glass to be fixed and obscured;
- The full height privacy screen will remove view. We ask for a reduction to 1.6m above FFL. Privacy Screens to be shall be of fixed panels or battens or louver style construction (with a maximum spacing of 20mm), in materials that complement the design of the approved development;
- The raised deck has no privacy screen. We ask for a 1.6m high privacy screen. Privacy Screens to be shall be of fixed panels or battens or louver style construction (with a maximum spacing of 20mm), in materials that complement the design of the approved development;
- The raised walkway will enable residents to look over the dividing fence. We ask for the side path to follow the existing levels.

3. OTHER MATTERS/CONDITIONS OF ANY CONSENT

- Dilapidation reports, including photographic surveys, of the adjoining properties must be provided to the Principal Certifying Authority prior to any works commencing on the site (including demolition or excavation). The reports must detail the physical condition of those properties listed below, both internally and externally, including walls, ceilings, roof, structural members and other similar items. The dilapidation report is to be prepared by a suitably qualified person. A copy of the report must be provided to Council, the Principal Certifying Authority and the owners of the affected properties prior to any works commencing. Post-Construction Dilapidation Reports, including photos of any damage evident at the time of inspection, must be submitted after the completion of works. The report must: compare the post-construction report with the pre-construction report, clearly identify any recent damage and whether or not it is likely to be the result of the development works, should any damage have occurred, suggested remediation methods.
- The Applicant must provide a certificate to ensure the recommendations of the risk assessment required to manage the hazards as identified in the Geotechnical Report are to be incorporated into the construction plans. The certificate shall be prepared by a qualified geotechnical engineer.
- The external finish to the roof shall have a medium to dark range (BCA classification M and D) in order to minimise solar reflections to neighbouring properties. Any roof with a metallic steel finish is not permitted.
- The Applicant is to provide a certification of drainage plans detailing the provision of on-site stormwater detention in accordance with Council's Water Management for Development Policy. Detailed drainage plans are to be

prepared by a suitably qualified Civil Engineer, who has membership to the Institution of Engineers Australia, National Professional Engineers Register (NPER) and registered in the General Area of Practice for civil engineering.

- Excavation work is to ensure the stability of the soil material of adjoining properties, the protection of adjoining buildings, services, structures and / or public infrastructure from damage using shoring, retaining walls and support where required. All retaining walls are to be structurally adequate for the intended purpose, designed and certified by a Structural Engineer.
- The development is required to be carried out in accordance with all relevant Australian Standards.
- A survey certificate prepared by a Registered Surveyor at the following stages of construction: (a) Commencement of perimeter walls columns and or other structural elements to ensure the wall or structure, to boundary setbacks are in accordance with the approved details. (b) At ground level to ensure the finished floor levels are in accordance with the approved levels, prior to concrete slab being poured/flooring being laid. (c) At completion of the roof frame confirming the finished roof/ridge height is in accordance with levels indicated on the approved plans.
- All plant and equipment is to be located within the basement of the building and is not to be located on balconies or the roof. Plans and specifications complying with this condition must be submitted to the Certifying Authority for Approval prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate. The Certifying Authority must ensure that the building plans and specifications submitted, referenced on and accompanying the issued Construction Certificate, fully satisfy the requirements of this condition. Reason: Minimise impact on surrounding properties, improved visual appearance and amenity for locality
- In order to minimise atmospheric air pollution, the proposed fire place is to burn non- solid fuel only.

F. REASONS FOR REFUSAL

My clients ask Council to refuse the DA as the proposal is contrary to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act:

1. No Clause 4.6 has been submitted. Council is not satisfied that under clause 4.6 of the LEP seeking to justify a contravention of the development standard that the development will be in the public interest because it is inconsistent with the objectives of the standard and the objectives for development within the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out.

2. The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to satisfy objectives and planning controls of LEP:

- Aims of Plan
- Zone Objectives
- Height of Buildings
- Exceptions to Development Standards
- Earthworks: no Geotechnical report submitted

3. The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* as it fails to satisfy objectives and planning controls of DCP:

- Excessive Wall Height & Number of Storey
- Unacceptable Building Separation
- Excessive Excavation & Geotechnical Concerns
- Stormwater Concerns
- Impacts Upon Adjoining Properties: View Loss
- Impacts Upon Adjoining Properties: Privacy
- Impacts Upon Adjoining Properties: Visual Bulk

4. The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* in that the plans and documentation are misleading as they do not clearly portray the true extent of works proposed. The plans include inaccuracies and inconsistencies and insufficient information has been provided in order to enable a detailed assessment.
5. The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* in that the proposal would not satisfy the matters for consideration under Biodiversity & Conservation SEPP 2021 and Resilience & Hazards SEPP 2021
6. The proposal is contrary to Section 4.15(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* in that it will have an adverse impact through its bulk, scale and siting on the built environment, and through lack of landscape provision, and adverse impact on the natural environment. The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the adjoining properties by virtue of the excessive building bulk, scale and mass of the upper floor and its associated non-complaint envelope.
7. The site is not suitable for the proposal pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* in that this area of the site is unsuitable for a development of such excessive bulk and scale.
8. The proposals are unsuitably located on the site pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(c) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.
9. The proposal does not satisfy Section 4.15(1)(d) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 in that the proposal does not adequately address the amenity of neighbours
10. The proposal is contrary to the public interest pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(e) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. The proposed development is not in the public interest as the development is inconsistent with the scale and intensity of development that the community can reasonably expect to be provided on this site by nature of the applicable controls. The development does not represent orderly development of appropriate bulk, scale or amenity impact in the locality and approval of such a development would be prejudicial to local present and future amenity

as well as desired future character and therefore is not in the public interest. The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining residential properties, and for this reason is contrary to the public interest.

G. CONCLUSION

The proposed dwelling is not consistent with the intent of the LEP standards and DCP controls as they are reasonably applied to the proposal.

The variations to LEP standards and DCP controls are considered unreasonable in this instance. The cumulative effect on these non-compliances cause considerable amenity loss to my clients' property.

The development will not sit well within the streetscape with non-compliance to LEP standards and DCP controls causing considerable concern. In this regard, the proposal is considered excessive in bulk and scale and would be consider jarring when viewed from the public domain.

Commissioner Moore revised the NSWLEC planning principle for assessing impacts on neighbouring properties within Davies v Penrith City Council [2013] NSWLEC 1141

"The following questions are relevant to the assessment of impacts on neighbouring properties:
How does the impact change the amenity of the affected property? How much sunlight, view or privacy is lost as well as how much is retained?
How reasonable is the proposal causing the impact?
How vulnerable to the impact is the property receiving the impact? Would it require the loss of reasonable development potential to avoid the impact?
Does the impact arise out of poor design? Could the same amount of floor space and amenity be achieved for the proponent while reducing the impact on neighbours?
Does the proposal comply with the planning controls? If not, how much of the impact is due to the non-complying elements of the proposal?"

My clients contend that the proposed development severely impacts my clients' property, and in terms of amenity, there is excessive sunlight, view or privacy loss. The loss is unreasonable. My clients' property is not vulnerable to the loss that is presented. The loss arises out of poor design, either through non-compliance to envelope controls or poorly located built form.

It is considered that the proposal is inappropriate on merit and unless amended plans are submitted, this DA must be refused for the following reasons:

- The application has not adequately considered and does not satisfy the various relevant planning controls applicable to the site and the proposed development.
- The proposed dwelling is incompatible with the existing streetscape and development in the local area generally.
- The proposed dwelling will have an unsatisfactory impact on the environmental quality of the land and the amenity of surrounding properties.
- The site is assessed as unsuitable for the proposal, having regard to the relevant land use and planning requirements.

It is considered that the public interest is not served.

The proposed development does not follow the outcomes and controls contained within the adopted legislative framework.

Having given due consideration to the matters pursuant to Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 as amended, it is considered that there are multiple matters which would prevent Council from granting consent to this proposal in this instance.

The proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site and an unbalanced range of amenity impacts all of which would result in adverse impacts on my clients' property.

Unless the Applicant submits Amended Plans to resolve all of the adverse amenity impacts raised within this Submission, my clients' ask Council to REFUSE this DA.

We ask that if Council in their assessment of this application reveals unsupported issues, which prevent Council from supporting the proposal in its current form, and writes to the applicant describing these matters, we ask for that letter to be forwarded to us.

My clients trust that Council will support my clients' submission and direct the proponent to modify the DA plans, as outlined above. My clients ask Council Officers to inspect the development site from my clients' property so that Council can fully assess the DA.

Yours faithfully,

Bill Tulloch

Bill Tulloch BSc [Arch] BArch [Hons1] UNSW RIBA RAIA
PO Box 440 Mona Vale
NSW 1660