From:DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.auSent:23/08/2022 9:08:57 PMTo:DA Submission MailboxSubject:Online Submission

23/08/2022

MRS Anne Potter 10 Barrabooka Street ST Clontarf NSW 2093

## RE: DA2022/1123 - 8 Barrabooka Street CLONTARF NSW 2093

Submission - DA2022/1123 (the DA)

Dear Sir \ Madam,

We, Anne Potter of 10 Barrabooka Street CLONTARF would like to make a submission with respect to the following property.

Address: Lot 17 Sec 61 DP 758044 No 8 Barrabooka Street Clontarf

Proposal: Alterations and additions to a dwelling house

My concern stems from the excessive size of the "alteration" and the impact on my view. Direct impact on my property.

Scale of Dwelling

The proposed DA grossly understates the size of this proposal. The footprint on No 8 will increase by well over 100%. Using the existing ground floor foot as a guide, it goes from 77m2 to 165m2. In fact, the wall facing my property is being extended by ~10m. This is over a 100% increase in length against the existing wall. The proposal is out of keeping with Clontarf and would be better suited to another LGA.

Impact on view

The impact of all this non-compliance is a proposed new 3 story wall which extends 10m beyond the existing wall today. The impact is, apart from being ugly it will reduce the view to the south from my main bedroom by in excess of a 25 degree arc. It represents ~20% reduction in my view. I estimate the impact on my view from my front balcony is closer to 30 degree which also equates to a similar 20% loss.

Further I lose all the ambience of seeing the southern part of the sky. This proposal is going to deprive me of a view I have had since 1965 and reduce the value of my property. Street off set

Page 21 of the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) compares the street off-set against the houses on No8's left, e.g No 6 and No 4 but not No 2. On the northern side of the property i.e. where my property is, the SEE neglects to mention that the proposal is not consistent with No 10 and 12 Barrabooka Street. The tendency in this part of Clontarf is that houses are set back in their blocks. Where it varies it is driven considerations like whether the block has been sub-divided or it is narrow. It is not the case here.

Height variation

Page 19 and 20 of the SEE highlight that the roof line on the north western corner will be above legal height. It directly impacts me. Further @8.9m the roof and wall height does not meet council's own height to boundary ratio of 1/3. Based on the plans the distance to my boundary is 2.85m and with a height of 8.9m the ratio is 3.12(x). I other words the wall and roof height are non-compliant.

## **Tree Planting**

I am very concerned that the existing exotics (Chinese Elm) are highlighted in the plans \ drawings as being maintained. In many council districts Chinese Elm is classified as a weed and I am surprised Northern Beaches Council is supportive of these being maintained. Summary

My primary concern is the size of the proposed dwelling, and the negative impact on the value of my property with the reduction in view. Further it is not within guidelines and aesthetically it not very attractive. I am not supportive of this development proposal.

I appreciate Council's consideration in this matter.

Kind regards

Anne J Potter 23 August 2022

Can you please contact my son Gavan Potter on **example a set of the set of th**