

---

**Sent:** 7/06/2022 4:52:23 PM

**Subject:** DA 2022/0742 78 Chisholm Avenue, Avalon Beach NSW 2107

Kerin English and John Walters  
71 Chisholm Avenue,  
Avalon Beach NSW 2107

Dear Sir or Madam

While recognising that the owners of 78 Chisholm Avenue have the right to develop their property, we are writing to object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- 1) **View loss.** Our property currently has filtered views of Pittwater. The proposed large and bulky extension to the rear and south of 78 Chisholm Avenue will result in Pittwater view loss for our amenity. The proposed development will result in view loss for the public who often pause and enjoy gazing at Pittwater from the turning circle on Chisholm Ave while out walking.
- 2) **The site is zoned C4 Environmental Living.** The bulky additions are inconsistent with this zoning. The proposal contradicts the natural beauty inherent in the Pittwater foreshore where it is located. There is a clear view of 78 Chisholm Avenue from Clareville Beach.
- 3) **Overdevelopment.** The proposed bulky additions to the property do not meet the aims of the Pittwater Local Environment Plan (LEP) 4.15(1) a, i and 4.15 (2) a,b,g,i,j, of low impact residential in areas which have special ecological, scientific and aesthetic value.
- 4) **The size of the addition.** The proposed works are very high; extend out into the rear garden of the property to a significant extent; and extend out on the North and South sides of the property towards their neighbours at 76 Chisholm Ave and 80 Chisholm Ave. This will not complement the natural environment in which the site is located. The form and massing of the building are inconsistent with the Pittwater Development Control Plan and LEP controls. There is no reason why a compliant solution can not be found for the proposed building. The following non compliant statistics for this build proposal support our objection. Building height 12.6 v 8.5 m (48% non compliant), set side back 1.4 v 2.5 m (78% non compliant), building envelope south 9m height requires a 5.5 m set back versus 1.5 m proposed (366% non compliant), build envelope north 7 m height requires a 3.5 m set back versus 1 m proposed (350% non compliant).

In conclusion we are asking that the council refuse this DA for the reasons outlined above and request that an amended DA be presented which achieves the goals of the owners. This being, for comfortable living for two people so that they will be able to remain in their home as they age, stated in their development application. We request that they amend their DA to be harmonious with the Pittwater LEP and DCP and caring of their immediate neighbours at 80 and 76 Chisholm Ave.

Yours faithfully

Kerin English and John Walters  
(71 Chisholm Ave)