

Objection to DA 0081/2019

We, the owner occupiers of 1/305 Sydney Road in Balgowlah, object to the plans on the following grounds:

Severe adverse impact on our amenity; Loss of light and loss of privacy

Due to the size and scale of the proposal we stand to lose a significant amount of daylight from our north facing living areas and Garden. Same applies to our south facing back garden. The proposed building at the north end of the lot facing Sydney Road and the second storey addition to existing 307 do not comply with building regulations regarding set back of the second storey addition with respect to the adjoining property.

305 the building and gardens will be overlooked from every angle. The impact of the proposal to our amenity and privacy is completely unacceptable.

Obscured access to our land and to our own parking space/garage

There is a slight improvement in this version of the DA where the access to 305 is concerned. The setback of the building adjacent to the garage of 305 has been increased to allow better access. However, the placement of the waste enclosure right where unit 1/305 needs to back out to in order to exit in forward motion to Sydney Road, is unfortunate. The whole area of the historic drive should be left completely free of obstruction of any kind, including waste enclosures, planting boxes, fences, screens etc.

Heritage impact

The plan does not comply with any guidelines set for developing Heritage listed items in the Council guidelines or the Burra charter.

The heritage impact of this plan is quite simply the complete destruction of any heritage character, features, fabric and the surrounding landscape setting. The SOHI attached is an interesting read as the findings can only be described as false and misleading in an effort to downplay the significance of the heritage value of the property. Whether or not property can be seen from the street or whether some building is less or more of an example of a particular style are poor, childish arguments. 307 Sydney Road has been added to the local heritage listing for a reason and it's green, open leafy setting is as much a Heritage feature as the building itself.

It is interesting that in the current DA process, the evaluation of the heritage value of a property or a place is left to the applicant. For proper conservation and preservation of heritage, should the responsibility to assess and evaluate such matters not lie with the council? As it now stands, it is almost too easy for a developer to hire so called experts to argue their points with complete disregard for history of a site and often purely economic drivers thus can lead to the loss of irreplaceable and precious sites of local or national heritage significance.

In an infill development like this one *“a new building in an established heritage context may be adjacent to a heritage building, within a conservation area, or in a heritage site or precinct. Good infill projects are sympathetic to the surrounding features, attributes and historic context, in terms of their scale, form, siting, character, materials and details. They should enhance and complement the*

existing urban, suburban or rural character. When designing infill or new work, the qualities that give a place its character should be maintained in a way that respects the old while meeting the amenity needs of its users”

“All new work in heritage contexts should retain and enhance the heritage value of the place. New work should respect the context, strength, scale and character of the original, and should not overpower it.”

The proposed development builds on top of the heritage building, it builds a 2 story dwelling immediately in front of the heritage building, and also builds right behind and even under the building. To say that this proposed development would retain any heritage, or to claim that this would *“respect the context, strength, scale and character of the original and should not overpower it”* is simply laughable. The scale is just too much for the site and the new development hides the original heritage building completely from every angle. The proposal is in no way sympathetic to the character of the item and proposed new work not only covers up the original building in its entirety but also sets to destroy the character of the surroundings completely including 30's original garden paths, old stone walls lining the property, rocky outcrops at the back of the property not to mention most of the mature vegetation on site.

We carried out renovation work recently on our property (DA 308/2016). In preparation we talked to planning officers and heritage officers of then Manly council and were told in no uncertain terms what we could or could not do (no extending or building in front of our property, matching the rebuilt extension to the house in render/colour and style, no significant increase in footprint etc). I do hope that the same rules and interpretation of guidelines are applied to this case as I would hate to see extra freedom given to a developer compared to owner occupiers like ourselves. We have finalized the works in accordance with our DA and have managed to save and enhance period features of our property both internally and externally. We would like to invite the representatives of the council to visit our property to witness first hand a truly sympathetic development of a heritage property and to also assess the true scale of the proposal next door and the truly devastating impact of it to the surroundings we all here enjoy.

We would welcome a plan to update the existing property and even extending it up and out to the back to a degree that would not have such a devastating effect to the Heritage value of the property. In its current form the application must be refused.

Size and scale of the proposal

The proposed plan exceeds the floor space ratio for the area. The calculation by the developer for the FSR does not even account for current right of carriageway easement on the shared part of the driveway from Sydney Road. With the Easement in place the area cannot be accounted for in the calculation of FSR. It is also worth noting that as a heritage site the normal zoning FSR should not be applied anyway and the FSR should remain in keeping with the rest of the local Heritage I24 at less than 0.4:1.

Storm water/drainage

The size and bulk of the proposal raise serious doubts for the handling of storm water runoff to our garden and our property at 305 Sydney Road. We are especially worried about possible damage to our sandstone foundations caused by runoff from 307 if these plans were to go ahead. The landscape plans clearly show that there is hardly any unbuilt/un-paved garden/outdoor space left on the combined lots other than the lowest part of the (north end) of 307 Sydney road.

Traffic and parking

With the addition of 8 new units on subject sites currently housing just 2 families the traffic implications from both Boyle Street and Sydney Road are significant.

The private drive from Sydney Road is currently serving 4 properties and with deliveries and maintenance services (gardeners and such) becomes easily blocked.

Boyle Street is too narrow for 2 cars to pass and the parking is a nightmare at the best of times due to not only resident street side parking but with people from outside the area parking their cars and taking public transport to city etc. Access to service the new units and their 14 new car spaces from Boyle Street is a major problem. The street is not wide enough for safe access and exit.

The creation of the underground parking as planned requires the developer to excavate under the existing Heritage listed house at 307 Sydney Road. How is this to be achieved without damaging the structural integrity of 307 and more importantly our property at 305 Sydney Road.

Conclusion

On the basis of all points above the development application should be rejected as completely unsuitable for the site.

Tuukka Salonen and Hanna Marjukka Maki-Hokkonen

1/305 Sydney Road, Balgowlah NSW 2093