
Sent: 24/11/2020 8:26:11 AM

Subject: Fwd: DA 2020/1381 LOT 6 DP 25924 13 Kalianna Crescent, Beacon Hill

Dear Ms Shirley,

Re:DA2020/1381 LOT 6 DP25924

13 Kalianna Crescent, Beacon Hill

We are the owners of the property known as 15 Kalianna Crescent, Beacon Hill and refer to your letter dated November 6, 2020 and received on Tuesday, November 16, 2020. After reviewing the plans we make the following comments.

We are of the opinion that the proposed alterations and additions are not appropriate for the site as bulk, height and the floor space ratio issues need to be addressed as well as overlooking and other issues effecting our property.

The proposed alterations etc show a very bulky property over a number of levels which is situated on a small site, as well as showing non complying setbacks from Kalianna Crescent on both the southern and northern boundary, these issues need to be addressed and rectified.

The father of Mrs Hansen, (the applicant) lives in the garage of the existing house and the proposed alterations are to incorporate a separate dwelling which makes the proposed house a dual occupation property. The floor space ratio (FSR) appears to be excessive and we expect don't comply with the DCP plus we question whether the green areas comply with the DCP also.

Our privacy is a serious matter and we note that the proposed swimming pool and deck will allow anyone on that level to look into our house and backyard as the floor height of the decks will be generally above the common fence. We note that a screen is proposed, but expect the noise levels to increase with the new deck and pool, and overlooking is possible with a screen and would do nothing to reduce the noise. Due to this possibility we propose that a hard wall be constructed on the decks on the western side to prevent overlooking and the expected increase in noise levels as the privacy screen will not abate the additional noise.

All fenestration on the western side of the proposed building should be either frosted glass or highlight windows to provide us with the privacy that we expect from such a building.

Following writing the above, we have had the opportunity to read the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) and we consider it to be deceptive in some matters as to some of its contents. We are not well versed in planning matters but we make the following further comments.

The preamble states that there are no existing covered car parking sites for the owners etc. but doesn't mention why this is the case. The garaging for the existing house has been converted into accommodation for Mrs Hanson's father and we note that this accommodation, although marked on the plans, is a completely separate residence. The family have four cars, one for Mrs Hanson, one for Mr Hanson, one for their daughter and one for Mrs Hanson's father, all but one parked on the street.

We would be pleased to understand what the total floor space would be, incorporating all accommodation of the proposed dwelling including the converted garages, and therefore what the FSR would be of the proposed three storey house. As previously mentioned, we believe that the proposed dwelling will be too bulky for the site, particularly with ceiling heights being 2.7 metres and ceiling heights not known for Mrs Hanson's father's accommodation.

In respect of the front set back the SEE reads as though only the proposed garages are non complying but the SEE omits to mention the accommodation above the garages are non compliance also. The current house and garage already breach the set back rules and the proposed new plans further contravene planning controls.

Another matter that we are greatly concerned with are the matters of privacy and noise. Paragraph D15 of the SEE states that "A new 1.8 metre high boundary fence is proposed with the neighbour at 15 Kalianna Crescent". We know nothing of this proposal and would not be consenting to this as a new 1.8 metre boundary fence was built six years ago, it is in very good condition and would not alleviate any privacy or noise concerns that we have. The existing and proposed new deck will be above the top of the existing boundary fence which allows any one standing on those decks to see into our house and backyard. We note that the boundary fence is not shown on the plans and that no RLs are supplied of the fence or deck heights to substantiate our concerns. Although a privacy screen is proposed, this would do nothing to alleviate the noise and privacy and needs to be a hard solid wall. The statement made in the SEE, being D8 is completely erroneous and we consider shows no appreciation of the noise or privacy issues.

Paragraph D3 of the SEE purports to deal with noise issues, which we believe it does not. Currently, our neighbours at 13 Kalianna Crescent enjoy the use of a rear deck which is situated close to our joint boundary. That deck has a timber screen on the western side and that assists us somewhat with privacy but does virtually nothing to abate the music, voices and other noise emanating from that area. Our neighbours use their rear deck regularly and the noise is considerable. We believe that a hard wall of 1.8 metres built on the decks' western extremities might reduce the noise emanating from that area of our neighbour's home and give us some amenity to enjoy our house.

We note that the conclusion of the SEE states that the proposed plans show a property which "is generally compliant with Planning Controls". We do not share the author's opinion on a number of matters and feel that the council must deal with these apparent discrepancies of the planning controls. Should you wish to discuss these matters further or meet with us, please ring Jan Harrison on 0402 113 217.

Yours Sincerely, Jan Harrison and Misha Harrison-Moore