Northern Beaches Local Planning Panel Northern Beaches Council PO Box 1336 DEE WHY NSW 2099

> Mr JR Brady 58 Beaconsfield St Newport NSW 2106 13 April 2020

Attention: Carly Sawyer

RE: **DA No 2019/1280**

Address: 11 Queens Pde Newport, 13 Queens Pde Newport, 60 Beaconsfield St Newport, 62

Beaconsfield St Newport, 7 Queens Pde Newport and 9 Queens Pde Newport

Description: Demolition works and construction of multi-unit housing with associated works

carparking and landscaping works

I am the owner of 58 Beaconsfield Street Newport, which is directly adjacent and to the east of the development.

I would firstly like to thank council for taking into consideration the issues that I raised in my previous correspondence of 6 January 2020.

Two issues I would like raise again in regards to this application.

- 1) Height- the height of the building at 9.6 metres exceeds the DCP. The DCP sets height limitations at 8.5 metres which is the maximum. The development already utilizes the full extent of the allowable building envelope within the control plan. Why is it acceptable to breach these limitations by 1.1 metres. If there are limitations set at maximums, then why is the developer using these as a minimum. Council should reject these outright, otherwise the control plans are meaningless.
- 2) Loss of natural sunlight to my rear yard- in the "Development Application Assessment report", the author acknowledges that my property will suffer a further loss of sunlight. In fact, if you refer to the attached shadow diagrams there will **no natural sunlight** available to my rear yard during winter at any time. The council author of the report has relied and used extracts from the developer's consultant "Symons Goodyer" report. This report is incorrect and makes false assumptions. The report states that there is a difference between the levels of 13 Queens Pde and 58 Beaconsfield St of 1 metre, this has occurred due to a stone retaining wall and levelling of the rear yard of 13 Queens Ave many years ago. On top of this wall a number of plants have been situated in very recent times by the owner, only the gum tree was an original planting, the timber palling fence of 1.8m is situated below this wall. The report states that this "fence would have an apparent height of 2.8 m when viewed from Beaconsfield street". This is completely incorrect and tries to negate the effect of the proposed building over shadowing by the reference to fence shading.

Please see the following photos for your reference, showing the fence at 1.8 metres from the Beaconsfield St side view.





The current plantings and fence do not cause a complete blockage of natural sunlight, but rather a filtering of the light. A building will block this light. Currently I do use this area for gardening and private recreation, which is not possible in the front yard facing a very busy Beaconsfield St. The DCP states that my property should have 3 hrs of natural sunlight to my private space. The backyard is my private space.

The council reports states, "the loss of solar access is unavoidable due to the location of the dwelling at 58 Beaconsfield St, towards the rear of the site". The current dwelling at 13 Queens Pde does not cause any overshadowing issues. If the developer did not seek to over maximise the coverage on the site, then a more modest outcome could be found. In other words, if the development was scaled down, then my property would not have to suffer such an adverse outcome.

In closing it would be appreciated if my comments could be closely considered by the Planning Panel when determining this development

Yours sincerely



Shadow existing

