
From: Hugh Halliwell
Sent: 22/06/2023 1:56:37 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Cc: Judy Newman
Subject: Submission - DA 2023/0646 - 121 Narrabeen Park Parade, Mona Vale
Attachments: Submission - 121 Narrabeen Park Parade, Mona Vale.pdf;

Good afternoon,

Please find attached a submission prepared on behalf of the owners at 119 Narrabeen Park Parade, Mona Vale, in relation to the abovementioned DA.

Do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Regards



**WESTERN
SYDNEY
PLANNING**

HUGH HALLIWELL
PRINCIPAL

PO Box 278, Baulkham Hills NSW 1755

M [REDACTED] E [REDACTED]
westernsydneyplanning.com.au



22 June 2023

Chief Executive Officer
725 Pittwater Road
Dee Why NSW 2099

Attention: Maxwell Duncan – Principal Planner

RE: DA 2023/0646 – 121 Narrabeen Park Parade, Mona Vale – Demolition works and construction of a dwelling house

Dear Max,

I have been requested to prepare a submission in relation to the proposed Development Application (DA 2023/0646) for demolition works and construction of a dwelling house at 121 Narrabeen Park Parade, Mona Vale ("the site").

My client's property is located adjacent to the site on the southern boundary and will be greatly affected by the proposed development.

In particular, the following concerns are raised in relation to the DA:

1. Building height
2. View sharing
3. Solar access
4. Visual privacy
5. Private open space

Further details in relation to the above concerns are set out in the below submission.

1. Building height

The site and many others on the eastern side of Narrabeen Park Parade are restricted by an 8m building height control, compared to a typical 8.5m height control that other properties in the locality are limited to. Upon review of the architectural plans and supporting Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE), the proposal is reliant on calculating the building height from natural ground level, rather than existing ground level, as required under Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014.

The proposed building height and overall bulk and scale of the development is a fundamental concern for my client.

Western Sydney Planning

ABN 68 895 983 596

PO Box 278, Baulkham Hills NSW 1755

M [REDACTED]

E [REDACTED]

westernsydneyplanning.com.au

In this regard, we request clarification on the proposed building height and the height be recalculated from the existing ground level, as the height and overall bulk and scale of the dwelling will have adverse amenity impacts for my client and their property.

Further, we request that Council consider closely the building envelope along the southern elevation, as any encroachment, along with any building height variation will result in an unreasonable impact upon my client's property.

2. View sharing

The proposal, including the supporting SEE fail to consider the likely impacts the dwelling will have on views from the public domain (i.e. Narrabeen Park Parade). The primary objective of the 8m height limit along this stretch of Narrabeen Park Parade noted above is to ensure that views currently enjoyed from the street can be protected and maintained.

Further, while the primary view from my client's home is to the south towards Warriewood Beach, the view to the north-east should not be disregarded. All views from the property, including to the north-east hold high-value for my client. The eastern point of the proposal at Level 2 and 3 needs to be confirmed in order to determine the extent of any impact on views from my client's property.

In this regard, it is considered that the proposal is unable satisfy the outcomes of the Clause C1.3 of Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan ("P21 DCP") in relation to ensuring a reasonable sharing of views amongst dwellings, and the protection and maintaining of views from the public domain.

It is requested that height poles be erected to determine the extent of impact of the dwelling from both the public and private domain.

3. Solar access and private open space

Due to the orientation of my client's site and others along the eastern side of Narrabeen Park Parade, the proposed dwelling will likely have an adverse impact on the solar access their home receives. In particular, several north facing windows and a north facing terrace will be severely impacted.

The upper floor terrace and balcony, which are directly adjacent to the dwelling's principal living areas are the main private open space areas, and maximising solar access to these areas is vital for my client and their amenity.

The submitted shadow diagrams offer little confidence to my client that their property will receive a minimum 3 hours of solar access in accordance with Clause C1.4 of P21 DCP.

At present, the proposal has not demonstrated consistency with the outcomes and controls of Clause C1.4 and C1.7.

In this regard, we kindly request that hourly shadow diagrams from 9am – 3pm on June 21, as well as

elevation shadow diagrams are provided demonstrating the extent of overshadowing to all north facing windows and terrace area.

4. Visual privacy and private open space

The dwelling will result in an unreasonable impact on the visual privacy to my client's property. The proposal is overly reliant upon landscaping in the form of landscape planters to provide privacy, rather than incorporating other measures, such as design.

One such example is the excessively large Level 3 deck servicing a 'Study/Bed' and 'Bathroom'.

The size of the deck is overly excessive for the rooms it services, which are not principal living areas. A substantially reduced deck can provide the same amenity outcome for the applicant than the deck, as proposed. It is requested the deck be reconsidered in its current form and be reduced, in turn providing an improved privacy outcome for my client and continuing to provide the same level of amenity for the applicant.

Another concern is the 'East Terrace' on Level 1, which is located with an almost nil setback to the southern boundary and approximately 3m above my client's swimming pool and terrace area. This will result in a complete loss of privacy for my client. We request that the terrace be amended to comply with the minimum side building setback control and appropriate privacy measures, such as screening be incorporated.

It is considered that the proposal fails to satisfy the outcomes of Clause C1.5 and C1.7 of P21 DCP in relation to visual privacy and private open space.

Other

It is noted that the submitted Architectural Plans, prepared by Nanna Lesiuk do not include an East Elevation. We request that this be provided to better understand the full scope of work as well as any impact.

Should amended plans be submitted to Council, we kindly request the opportunity to review any changes and to provide any further comments.

Do not hesitate to contact me on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] should you wish to discuss any of the above.

Kind regards,



Hugh Halliwell
Principal