
Sent: 11/02/2024 4:33:00 PM
Subject: Att: Olivia Ramage - Planner : Objection to DA Number DA2024/0011
Attachments: Development Submission.pdf;

Dear Olivia,

RE: Objection to Development Application, Application Number [DA2024/0011](#) – 138 Lagoon St NSW 2101

Please see attached our letter of objection to the above application.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact us on 0438 587 843.

Kind regards,

Justin & Sarah Cameron

136 Lagoon St, Narrabeen NSW 2101

Olivia Ramage
Planner
Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655

Dear Olivia,

RE: Objection to Development Application, Application Number DA2024/0011 – 138 Lagoon St NSW 2101

We write this letter to formally lodge our objection to the proposed Development Application Number DA2024/0011 at 138 Lagoon St NSW 2101 (Proposed Development).

We are the owners and residents of 136 Lagoon St which is directly across Malcolm St from the Proposed Development, and we have deep concerns regarding some elements of the proposed design and their impact to our property and neighbouring properties.

Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE)

Firstly, we object to the concluding statement made under '3) *The Proposal*' on page 3 of this document that states there will be '*no effect on neighbouring properties due to the proposed additions*' and '*considerations have been given to bulk and form*', as both of these statements are incorrect when referencing the WDCP 2011 and State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 (SEPP).

a) Views

We currently have views of Narrabeen Lagoon as well as the trees/foliage to the northwest in the space between the current dwelling of the Proposed Development and 15 Malcolm St. Therefore, I disagree with the statement under '*Views (DCP D7)*' that our views as neighbours will not be affected by the proposed addition of a carport and roofed balcony extension on the western side of the Proposed Development.

If the Proposed Development does go ahead, it will effectively block the only water view we have in this direction.

This will almost certainly reduce the value of our property. We have taken advice from our selling agent, as we are looking to sell later in the year, who advised this blocking of our water view has the potential of reducing our valuation/asking price by a minimum of \$200K. Furthermore no consideration has been made for the potential of 'view sharing', as the western extension will effectively block our water view, simply for the gain of a new water view to the dwelling if the Proposed Development goes ahead.

Also as the proposed balcony will be full enclosed, it will replace our water view with a large amount of bulk and scale to our aspect in this direction.

Lastly I note there is significant room on the eastern side of the property for an entertaining deck which would not have an affect any neighbouring properties, however this does not have a view to be gained like the western side does.

Figures 1 & 2 below show our current water view as well as how our view will be blocked if the Proposed Development of extensions of balcony and carport go ahead.

b) Secondary Frontage Setback

Also a similar reference has been made regarding the secondary front setback, when stating these additions will '*not affect adjoining properties in view loss*', as again this is not correct. We also ask that the non-compliance of the 3.5m secondary frontage as per the SEPP be considered for this western side extension of a new carport and balcony when combined with factors such as privacy loss and potential overshadowing to other properties in closer vicinity.

c) Carport

- i) For this lot size the carport floor area appears to be at the limit or potentially exceeding the allowed 25m².
- ii) The carport appears to be located at a distance of less than the required 900m from the northwest side boundary.
- iii) Finally, the carport is not at least 1m behind the building line of the road frontage.

b) Balcony

- i) For this lot size the proposed balcony floor area appears to be at the limit or potentially exceeding the 15% of the total ground floor area of the dwelling.
- ii) The proposed balcony appears to be located at a distance of less than the required 900m from the northwest side boundary.
- iii) The proposed balcony is also higher than 3m above ground level (existing).
- iv) The proposed balcony does not appear to be positioned behind the building line of the road frontage on Malcolm St.

Figure 1.1 – Current view from our kitchen



Figure 1.2 – Blocked view from our kitchen if extension goes ahead.



Figure 2.1 – Current view from our balcony/entertainment area



Figure 2.2 – Blocked view from our balcony/entertainment area if extension goes ahead



Thank you for reading our objection submission Olivia. We kindly request that the reviewing authorities take the above objections into consideration when determining the Development Application for the Proposed Development. We trust that the relevant authorities will assess the objections raised and prioritise the rights of the effected residents.

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

Your Sincerely,

Justin & Sarah Cameron

136 Lagoon St Narrabeen 2101