
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 31/10/2022 1:18:48 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

31/10/2022

MS Judy Houlton
8 The Serpentine - 8 ST
Bilgola Beach NSW 2107
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2022/1494 - 2 A Allen Avenue BILGOLA BEACH NSW 2107

My objection relates to the height of the proposed development and variations of Clause 4.6 of PLEP 2014 which I believe should not be permitted for 2a Allen Ave DA 22/1494.

The Clause provides a mechanism by which a development standard can be varied.

It has to pass the following tests (in bold)

A) To ensure that any building, by virtue of its height and scale, is consistent with the desired character of the locality.

This is NOT the case with this development. The height far exceeds neighbours and virtually every square metre of the block is built on. The character of the locality is for low rise BEACH HOUSES, typically two storey, and no rooftop swimming pools.

Fundamental to the development is the tennis court. The so called existing tennis court is only a year old. The previous use was garden. A long time ago there did exist a court, possibly grass or loan. The surface is no longer "soft" ground.

B) To ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development.

This is also NOT the case with this development.

This grand house with the name "Wimbledon House" is bigger and taller and with construction to every corner be it above or below ground level.

C) To minimise any overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

There will be heightened overshadowing of 2 Allen Avenue

D) To allow for the reasonable sharing of views.

There has been no consideration given to the views to the southeast from 10 The Serpentine.

Furthermore the attempt to demonstrate view sharing from number 8 The Serpentine fails totally because of the intention to plant high palm trees to totally block any view. The sketches purported to show view sharing is from one fixed point on the property when in fact the view will be seriously impacted from all levels.

E) To encourage buildings that are designed to respond sensitively to the natural topography.

This design states that it assumes certain ground levels which are not evident and are totally misleading. If the design was to adhere to this requirement it would be a two storey dwelling.

F) To minimise the adverse visual impact of development on the natural environment heritage conservation areas and heritage items.

The sheer bulk of the intended development MAXIMISES not minimises the effect on the environment.

The requested variation in height is not small. In fact it is exceedingly large.

In this regard, it has been determined that the proposed roof form breaches the height standard by up to 3.5 metres (43%) at its highest point reducing to approximately 300mm along

its south eastern edge. The south eastern edge of the Level 3 terrace and associated landscape planter also breach the standard by up to 1.2 metres (18.75%) with the building height breaching elements depicted in in the building height blanket diagram.

We ask council to consider any variation very seriously as council are using their delegated authority (from DPE) to determine. This DA is complex but the variations are very high when looking at face value.

Such a development approval would set a dangerous precedent for Bilgola Beach.