From: Tim Garrett

**Sent:** 27/06/2022 1:55:40 PM

To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox

Cc: Nicola Garrett

Subject: DA2022/0658 - 1 Kanimbla Crescent BILGOLA PLATEAU NSW 2107

Attachments: DA2022 0658 response.pdf;

Dear Mr Pattalis,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the development application DA2022/0658.

I attached a document outlining our comments and concerns.

Please contact me by email or mobile phone to discuss, or if further information is required

regards Tim

Tim and Nicola Garrett 3 Kanimbla Crescent Bilgola NSW 2107

24th June 2022

For the attention of: Mr Dean Pattalis

Re: Submission for DA2022/0658

Dear Mr Pattalis,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the development application DA2022/0658.

Our comments relate to the proposed two storey 'South bedroom wing' within DA2022/0658 and the negative impact its bulk and scale will have on our adjoining property No. 3 Kanimbla Crescent.

The narrative in the applicant's submission seeks to diminish the adverse impact the proposed development will have on No. 3 Kanimbla Crescent. However, we believe that the proposed bulk and scale of the development will have an impact that is both significant and detrimental given the unusual shape, building orientation and intersection of lots 1 and 3 Kanimbla Crescent.

## 1. Impact of proposed bulk and scale

According to the Northern Beaches Development controls, the purpose of building setbacks are to provide privacy and to maintain adequate space between buildings. For regular shaped plots these controls would normally suffice, however in the current situation of irregular shaped plots (and the orientation of the existing buildings), applying the 'standard setback' we believe does not meet the intent of the building setback controls.

On face value the proposed development complies with most setbacks, however in extending to the maximum reach at the South boundary (6.5m) the proposed 'south wing' significantly obstructs No. 3 Kanimbla Crescent by cutting across the building line in front of its master bedroom (top level) and master bathroom (lower level).

While the development application attempts to reduce the impact on privacy through the use of "fixed privacy screening" at the western elevation this does not mitigate the bulk of the proposed development and the dominant visual impact it will have from the Eastern wing of No. 3 Kanimbla Crescent [see illustration below].



## Illustration of the impact of the 'sound wing proposal' on 3 Kanimbla Crescent:

## 2. Impact from private garden space of No. 3 Kanimbla Crescent on the western and southern boundary

The objectives of E4 zoning require all residential developments to be low-impact, and of low density and scale. Furthermore, developments should be integrated within its landscape and not have an adverse effect on the areas with special ecological, scientific or aesthetic values.

The bulk and scale of the proposed 'South bedroom wing' will be visually and spatially imposing when sitting in our private terraced garden space that sits on the west boundary. At a height of approximately 9 metres the building cannot be described as low impact as required by E4 zoning regulations.

Furthermore, Pittwater 21 DCP objectives state that: "In residential areas, buildings are to give the appearance of being secondary to landscaping and vegetation".

Flame zone bushfire planning controls, coupled with strong southerly winds and shade, makes it incredibly difficult to grow even low level plants and vegetation to reduce or soften the visual impact of the proposed development.

We believe there are ways our concerns could be addressed while retaining the amenity/scale desired by the applicant. For example, the proposed south wing could be positioned more centrally within its lot (with a 4.5m setback from the western boundary). Alternatively, increasing the setback from the southern boundary from 6.5m to 9.5m (with the current 2.2m western setback) would also reduce the domineering impact of the proposed development.

We therefore believe that modifications are required to the building scale and/or setbacks to meet the intention of the council's planning controls.

Regards

Tim and Nicola Garrett