
Sent: 18/09/2019 9:08:01 PM
Subject: Online Submission

18/09/2019

MR Robert Wilson
22 Idaline ST
Collaroy Plateau NSW 2097
robert.b.wilson@hotmail.com

RE: DA2019/0891 - 20 Idaline Street COLLAROY PLATEAU NSW 2097

We object to the following elements of the proposed development:

1. Site Survey is not accurate

a. The site survey included in the application is out of date and we have concerns that Council will not be able to accurately assess the impact of the proposed development. Our property at 22 Idaline Street was demolished in September 2018, and the setback of our new house is 6.6 metres which is not indicated on the survey, nor are the locations of the windows on our house accurately represented.

b. We also cannot determine where the windows on the second storey of the proposed development are located in relation to our existing bedroom windows, nor the distance between the properties, and therefore we cannot assess the impact on our privacy.

2. Non-compliant with minimum landscaped areas:

a. We note that the development does not meet the requirement for 40% landscaped area, which exists to ensure the neighbourhood amenity is pleasant and liveable.

3. Non-compliant with minimum front setback

a. The setback including the proposed feature stone pillars of this development would be 5.53 metres. This is approximately 1 metre further forward than the building line of the neighbouring properties, and therefore would have a detrimental, overbearing impact on the immediate area, including our home.

b. This would also have a detrimental effect on the broader streetscape. A house this far forward, would dominate the streetscape both on Idaline Street and from the cross-street Telopea Street, as it is the second house in from the intersection.

c. The application notes that there are other houses in the street that do not meet the minimum setback requirements, however, these are not in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development and therefore are not comparable. The houses in the immediate vicinity (18, 22, 24) meet the required setbacks. Furthermore, most if not all of the examples noted in the application were built under prior planning controls, or include carports rather than garages, and when these houses are eventually developed it would be expected that they will comply with setback minimums, to maintain fairness and uniformity in the street.

d. There are many houses in the street which do not have double garages, since the blocks are indeed small and therefore compromises must be made. There may be other options which would not compromise the minimum setback requirements, for example a smaller double garage, a single garage or a carport.

e. Even if Council considers a compromised setback for a garage, there is no justification for the second storey to be permitted to breach the setback requirements. A second storey built beyond the minimum setback would significantly impact views and privacy from the second storey of our property.