

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 26/06/2022 1:01:56 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

26/06/2022

MR Glenn Hinson  
40 Pringle AVE  
Belrose NSW 2085

**RE: Mod2022/0275 - 1 Drew Place BELROSE NSW 2085**

Glenn Hinson  
40 Pringle Ave,  
Belrose NSW 2085  
25/6/22.

RE:  
Notice of proposed development  
Modification No: Mod2022/0275 - DA2020/1072  
1 Drew Place Belrose.

Dear Anne-Marie,

I would like to raise some issues of concern regarding the above Notice of Proposed Development Modification.

I would particularly like to object to the proposed deletion of Clause 12 (a) as outlined in the report prepared by Boston Blyth Fleming.

"12(a) A planter box with an internal dimension of 600mm x 400mm is to be provided located adjacent to northern balustrade of the balconies for Units 5 and 6. Climbers to be planted into the planter boxes with wires or trellis provided 400mm above the top of the balustrade to encourage the climber to provide visual softening and enhanced privacy to adjoining properties. This submission also requests deletion of condition 12(a) on the basis that appropriate levels of privacy and built form screening are afforded through a combination of spatial separation and the implementation of the approved site landscape regime. Compliance with condition 12(a) is not only unreasonable and unnecessary but also potentially dangerous in the creation of a climbable structure immediately adjacent to the required balustrading. We are advised that the works required by condition 12(a) will not comply with the BCA in relation to the installation and performance of the required balustrading and accordingly this condition should be deleted."

I strongly refute and I am dismayed that the developer would wish to change a particular feature of the proposal that was our primary concern when the initial development was discussed.

Our main discussions with the developer were about the issues created by the 'units' on the second floors having living areas and balconies that would look directly into our backyard and the living and kitchen areas at the rear of our home. This would have an all-encompassing effect on the liveability and enjoyment of our home, our yard, garden, and pool. The units also look into our second-floor bedrooms and bathrooms. The provision of privacy screening was an attempt, in good faith, to minimise this impact. After viewing initial plans, the privacy screens that were covering the western corner of the terrace, were removed entirely in the final

drawings that were submitted and approved by Council. What is already very minimal privacy screening is now being eroded even more. We are very disappointed in the outcome of the final design in terms of the impact it has on the amenity of our property. We believe the 'good faith' discussions in the initial planning, to protect our privacy, have been ignored by the developer.

On page 4 of the same report.

"What the abovementioned authorities confirms is that in undertaking the comparative analysis the enquiry must focus on qualitative elements (numerical aspects such as heights, setbacks etc) and the general context in which the development was approved (including relationships to neighbouring properties and aspects of development that were of importance to the consent authority when granting the original approval)."

I strongly believe that the relationships to the neighbouring properties have been compromised by the attempted modifications, being of utmost importance in the initial application and hence these modifications should be rejected.

I also refute the claim on page 5.

"The modifications maintain the previously approved environmental outcomes in terms of residential amenity, landscaping, drainage and streetscape presentation."

The residential amenity of the surrounding properties has been dramatically affected by the initial proposal, but to heighten their impact by reducing methods of addressing privacy issues is not appropriate or fair.

Citing justifications such as existing vegetation is also not appropriate. The current vegetation is not stable and when the fencing is replaced some of this would be lost. The photographs have been conveniently photographed at ground level and do not show the true outlook from the second floors. A drone shot should have been used to indicate the true outlook and impact on surrounding properties. The photos do not consider that some of the existing vegetation is deciduous and as such are quite barren and affording little screening at certain times of the year.

I also object to the claim that any screening would be unsafe and contravene the building codes. There are materials available to screen and increase privacy on second floor buildings. Alternatively, the developer could consider building a higher solid balustrade. As much as I am concerned about my privacy, I am sure the residents of the units would also appreciate their privacy.

Having given due consideration to the modification of this development, I ask that council either reject these modifications or ask the developer to modify their proposal to go some way towards protecting the amenity and privacy of the surrounding neighbours.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Glenn Hinson.