

4th May 2021

Amendment to Development Application

DA2021/0114 - 74 Cumberland Avenue COLLAROY

View Loss Assessment

Dear Julie Edwards,

In response with your request for us 'to investigate alternate design solution(s) that facilitate a better outcome in relation to view sharing by reducing the view impacts on the adjoining dwelling house at No. 7 Lancaster Crescent, Collaroy.' We have modified the design of the proposed roof addition, reducing a substantial amount of bulk from the back section of the roof, and lowering of the roof pitching point and pitch to accommodate better access to the view corridor that runs diagonally across our site from the house at No.7 Lancaster Crescent.

In relation to the analysis of the view loss we have reflected upon the four (4) step process outlined in the Planning Principle of the Land and Environment Court, namely Tenacity Consulting Pty Ltd Vs Warringah Council (2004) NSWLEC 140.

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.

The view that is seen of higher value is that of the interface between the land and water, and not the dunes or vast ocean expanse beyond. This is the area we have concentrated on with the redesign of the roof.

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

ABN: 2846 4402 548

Sheralee Hogan B.Sc(Arch)B.(Arch) U.Syd

www.sitespecificdesigns.com.au

Sheralee.ssd@bigpond.com

0416 954 635 02 9979 3434

than standing views. The expectation to retain side views and sitting views is often unrealistic.

The views are in fact diagonally across the site and go from the rear Western boundary across the side Southern boundary of No.74 Cumberland Ave, and as such this is a difficult area to retain all of the view currently seen from No.7 Lancaster. It is also noted that the views from sitting positions would be unrealistic to retain, however we have certainly retained the majority of the standing view from the balcony (81%) with the alternate roof design. Refer to images attached.

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.

The views currently enjoyed from the Kitchen are not seen as significant, and from the Living and Dining room are narrow and predominantly the sand dunes. The alternate roof design has improved the small view of the beach interace in this location. The location that enjoys the better view of Long Reef Beach is standing on the balcony, and as mentioned the alternate roof design allows for 81% retention of this.

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.

We have proposed flattening the rear roof area over the western part of the first floor addition, similar to what is existing, with just the proposed new room having a gable roof form which is imperative for the streetscape aesthetic and traditional beach cottage look to be retained. We have proposed dropping the pitching point to 2.45m, and the pitch to 22', equating to a lowering of 330mm of roof height, and substantial bulk towards the western neighbouring homes. As the first

Site Specific Designs

ABN: 2846 4402 548

Sheralee Hogan B.Sc(Arch)B.(Arch) U.Syd

www.sitespecificdesigns.com.au

Sheralee.ssd@bigpond.com

0416 954 635 02 9979 3434

floor addition is in fact already compliant with councils controls we believe that this modified roof design is more than acceptable and the view sharing more than reasonable.

If you require any further information, please don't hesitate to contact me on 0416 954 635

Regards,

Sheralee Hogan

Sheralee Hogan B.Sc (Arch) B. (Arch) U. Syd.

SITE SPECIFIC DESIGNS

11 Hill St, Warriewood, NSW, 2102

19/10/2020