

To Anne-Marie Young at Northern Beaches Council ,

01.11.21

We are responding to the Notification Letter that we received from you dated 14th October 2021 from notifying us of the proposed development at 214 Hudson Parade, Clareville.

As Neighbours at 211 Hudson Parade, Clareville. NSW we are directly opposite the proposed development DA2021/1790 for Alterations and Additions to a dwelling house, including a swimming pool and garage at 214 Hudson Parade, across the road on the high side.

Whilst we are not opposed to the renovation in principle, we do have a number of valid concerns and know that the outcome of the development will have an adverse impact on us.

1.View Loss.

The Proposed Upper Roof Line of the Proposed Garage, Covered Entry, Foyer, Stairs, Bedroom and Ensuite spaces, which are located on the front boundary, creates a new significant obstruction to our existing view of the Pittwater waterway from our primary internal living space and outdoor recreation area.

The proposed roof line is the cause of the view loss and we question whether the pop-up highlight windows and butterfly roof structures are actually necessary for the intended & successful use. (I.e. garaging, Ensuite and bedroom)

If a more conventional, flat / minimum pitched roof structure could be considered as a reasonable design alternative, our concerns would go away.

Could a more skilled design result in a roof line that could be constructed more in keeping with the existing garage and carport and still facilitate the successful functioning of the same floor plan?

If this could be done without the secondary roof forms/highlight windows which are contributing mostly to our view loss, we could then both coexist as neighbours without any adverse impacts on us. Refer to sketch attached.

To fully understand the impacts of the proposed roof lines, we would request that council ask the applicant to accurately locate & erect height poles, so we can fully understand the impact and extent of the view lost as a result of the development at its worst points.

We would then like a view loss analysis be taken from standing & sitting inside our existing living room and our external deck / outdoor dining area, which is our primary internal & external living space and where our only view corridor of Pittwater currently exists.

We foresee the view loss to be at its worst point along the southern ridge of the level 4 / garage level (refer to sketch) and we believe the pop-up highlight window and butterfly roof forms may actually encroach on the typical side building envelope in this area.

As another design alternative, could this portion of the building that borders the proposed courtyard step down to comply with the side building envelope?

2. Excessive Bulk and Scale - Further contributing to view loss

Whilst we understand car parking structures may be located forward of the typical front boundary setback line where vehicle access is challenging, it was our understanding that these types of structures be constructed to be open sided where possible and limited in height.

This would minimise the size of structures / in order to reduce excessive bulk and scale along the street frontage/front boundary and retain views from private properties and the public domain.

Council controls further state the maximum width of such structures be no greater than 7.5m in width or 50% of the site's width, whichever is the lesser.

Does the proposed roofline above the Garaging and Entry foyer need to extend the full width of the street frontage on the front boundary line? We feel the total width of the proposal unnecessarily impacts on the views from our property.

3. Not in-keeping with the desired character of the locality.

We don't believe the proposal is in keeping with the desired character of the locality because of excessive bulk and scale, due to the large portion of the building being located forward of the 6.5m front setback line and the overall building footprint in general.

While the proposed development states that there is an improved overall landscape area, we find it hard to fully understand how this has been achieved, when it appears that the building footprint has significantly increased.

Is the existing boat house structure included in the hard surface area calculations?

We also find it hard to believe that sections of impervious area that are located under roof structures can be included as soft landscape. Is this acceptable?

Due to our concerns, could we please ask council to do a full review of the calculations to assist us, because the extent of the roof structures above these impervious areas are contributing to our view loss.

Further, it was our understanding that new developments in properties zoned E4 Environmental Living, regardless of existing footprints, should achieve a minimum of 60% soft landscaping? The objective of this control is to achieve a scenario where Residential Dwellings are positioned in a surrounding landscaped setting when viewed from the street, this is not the case for us.

In conclusion, considering the combined number of non-compliances, the scale of the proposed single residence at 214 Hudson Parade and the fact that it will enjoy its own expansive uninterrupted views of Pittwater, we think it is unfair and unreasonable for us to lose the greater portion of our only view which is very dear to us and highly valued. We fear that our property will be significantly devalued as a result of the view loss and request that council review whether the obstructing structures could be modified to be less impactful or designed in a way that still maintains our existing view. We strongly object to the proposal in its current form.

Yours Sincerely,
John & Chesne Raymond
211 Hudson Parade, Clareville. NSW
0418 677 224

