Sent:26/11/2020 10:00:30 AMSubject:7 Pavilion Street Queenscliff - Mod2020/0582 for DA2018/1892 Objection to
amendment DA

Attachments: 202011 Letter re cabana 7 Pavilion.pdf;

Please find attached an objection letter to the latest DA amendment for the development at 7 Pavilion Street, Queenscliff (MOD2020/0582 - DA2018/1892).

Northern Beaches Council PO Box 82 Manly NSW 1655

Queenscliff, 21 November 2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

We refer to DA 2018/1892 and the request for amendments to the DA in a letter from Nolan Consultants written on behalf of the owner of 7 Pavilion Street. In her application, the owner seeks to amend the approved plans to incorporate "a 1.94m high framed glazed panel to form part of the swimming pool fence". The reason used by the owner to justify the proposed amendment is ".....to provide a higher pool fence to improve safety to the occupants".

We have discussed the proposed wall with the husband of the owner during an onsite meeting on 10 September 2020. During this meeting, the husband still referred to the wall as a cabana, above which a roof would be mounted. He stated to us during that meeting that they did not require a DA approval for the cabana. We questioned this during the meeting. In subsequent communications, he referred to the cabana wall as 'temporary wall', 'window wall' and 'framed glazed panel'.

Whatever the structure is intended to be or is intended to become, we strongly object to the amendment as it impacts on the views (and the value) of the surrounding dwellings and units and does not materially improve the safety of the occupants.

With respect to the safety concerns raised, we fail to see how constructing a 1.95 meter high window frame along app. 10% of the cliff edge would address these concerns, when the remaining 90% of the cliff edge of the property has a low (1.20m) and extremely low (0.60m!!) glass fencing (the latter along the wet edge of the pool).

We believe the only way to address the owners safety concerns, if they are genuinely concerned about safety, is to propose to construct a 1.95 meter glass fence along the full cliff edge of their property. However, instead the owner has installed the lowest possible glass fencing along the wet edge of the pool, so that along the wet edge her views are not impacted by glass fencing. She does not appear to have any safety concerns whatsoever when it impacts her views, yet raises safety concerns when it is about an improvement that impacts her neighbours views but not her own.....

Below, please find under 1. photos demonstrating that the proposed amendment does not address the 'safety concerns' raised by the owner and under 2. photos showing the significant impact of proposed amendment have on the water views of the surrounding units and dwellings.

1. Photos regarding 'safety concerns'

Below please find a photo demonstrating how difficult it is to believe the genuine nature of the safety concerns raised by the owner.



2. Photos showing the impact on the views of surrounding units and dwellings

Below please find a photo demonstrating the significant impact the proposed amendment has on the water views of the surrounding units and dwellings.



We further note that there are a large number of areas where the development does not seem to comply with the DA, in addition to the cabana / window wall. We list some of these items below.

- 1. Proposed development encroaches on the property of Nr. 5 along the full boundary line. A concrete slab has been poured and several services have been installed over the boundary line;
- The balconies on the west cliff side of the property seem to be constructed too far out. Based on the DA drawings, we would expect these balconies not to extend over the main wall, though they clearly do;
- 3. the pergola that has been extended by up to 1 metre, towards the cliff edge and has a fixed roof (from under the extension of the level 2 balcony); and
- 4. The property appears to be constructed significantly over the southern boundary line, making the narrow pedestrian path even narrower.

We will notify the private certifier of these concerns in a separate letter.

Kind regards,

Freerk & Ingeborg Speckmann





