

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 11/02/2024 4:17:46 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: Online Submission

11/02/2024

MR gerard wallace  
18 / 60 Beaconsfield ST  
Newport NSW 2106

**RE: DA2023/1869 - 58 Beaconsfield Street NEWPORT NSW 2106**

In the statement of environmental effects by the developer, there is note of a breach of Clause 4.3 of Pittwater's Local Environmental Plan 2014 (PLEP), whereby the height of a buildings permissible on the site is a maximum of 8.5 metres. The developer has applied for a height variation for their proposed building, driven by lift structures on the building's communal roof area.

Architectural plan DA520 confirms that the western lift overrun breaches the height standard by between 620mm and 1.315 metres (15.4%) whilst the eastern lift overrun breaches the height standard by between 1.160 metres and 1.5 metres (17.6%). Certainly, as with our own residence, a lift structure to access the roof top is not necessary, and staircases would suffice.

However, moderating our objection to these lift structure breaches would be if we were assured that P21DCP's intentions were honoured here, namely that, generally: "Secondary Dwellings can be established in conjunction with another dwelling to encourage additional opportunities for more compact and affordable housing with minimal environmental impact in appropriate locations.

...and specifically:

"Future development will maintain a height limit below the tree canopy and minimise bulk and scale. Existing and new native vegetation, including canopy trees, will be integrated with the development."

It is our view that removing mature (high canopy) trees with the "promise" of replacing them with "mature trees" means we will be relying purely on the developer's opinion on what constitutes "mature trees". Specifically, there are several "Syragrus" palm trees being removed along the western boundary, possibly because of some recently granted easement for drainage, to the developer's benefit. We would ask that Council's Officer seeks assurances that the western boundary Palms be retained and other "mature trees" in the landscaping plan indeed provide the privacy both parties would want from rooftop activities in the proposed building.

The developer also asserts that "The central location of the lift shafts ensure that they will not be readily discernible in a streetscape context and will not in any measurable manner contribute to unacceptable building height, bulk or scale". That ignores the impact on those in the neighbouring building that will look out onto their proposed roofline.

Finally, the developer states: "it can be reasonably be concluded that, notwithstanding the building height breaching elements, the development is capable of existing together in harmony with surrounding and nearby development."

We would largely concur provided the boundary palm trees are retained and sufficient other truly mature trees are planted, whose canopy will "screen" the non-compliant rooftop at construction, not in 20 years' time.

Thank you for your consideration.