From: Annabel Semedo
Sent: Thursday, 21 April 2022 11:27 AM
To: Planning Panels - Northern Beaches
Subject: FOR REVIEW: NBLPP Meeting Notes_6 Dorrigo Ave_FINAL
Attachments: NBLPP Meeting notes_6 Dorrigo Av_AnnabelSemedo.docx

Categories: NBLPP

Hi Heidi,

RE: DA2021/1801 (55 Woolgoolga Street North Balgowlah)

Per our previous conversation, can you please forward the attached (updated) notes for review by the Panel following yesterday's meeting?

I look forward to your confirmation of my request.

Many thanks,
Annabel

Hi, I'm Annabel Semedo, speaking on behalf of my family of 4 with 2 young children. Our single-storey property is adjacent to 55 Woolgoolga St and positioned on the downhill slope to the South-East of it.

1. Thank you for the opportunity to raise our concerns with you directly regarding this DA. We really appreciate your time in hearing our perspective which we feel hasn't been genuinely addressed in the applicant's assessment and the council report.
2. Please understand we are not opposed to the project going ahead or multigenerational living but given the extent of the non-compliant aspects for such a large-scale build and the direct detrimental impacts this will have on our family; we are understandably requesting for a more fully compliant development.
3. This is especially important to us given it's within 1m of our rear boundary, the minimal sunlight we already receive due to overshadowing and considering the very strict application of the council controls to our own approved DA a year ago.
4. A key part of our DA was to try to accommodate our own parents by adding a guest room to the first floor of our small-scale addition. However council required us to increase our side setback (now 2m) due to bulk and scale and overshadowing our neighbours front yard despite us receiving no objections from them. We were forced to completely redesign the 50sqm floor area, which meant we had to remove the small guest room completely. Council also refused the removal of our compromised Jacaranda tree in the context of streetscape.
5. Our property is already massively overshadowed by multiple uphill properties and trees given the sloping topography of the surrounding site which means we receive very minimal amounts of sunlight all year round contributing to excess humidity and exacerbating my and my son's severe allergies and asthma.
6. As you can imagine, with all the recent floods, the excess stormwater from uphill properties has resulted in even higher humidity levels in our home, my son's asthma and coughing keeping us up most nights, rising damp and mould and a fallen brick retaining wall in our yard.
7. Given these factors, access to sunlight is a key part of our amenity and enjoyment of our private open living space. We even removed (at our own expense) a large tree from the adjacent North corner boundary to allow for more sunlight into our property.
8. By excessively pushing the maximum building height, the proposed building will reduce our solar access by a further 50% to about 1 hour of sun a day. Not only will it completely overshadow our passive drying spaces, but it will also overshadow our entire primary private open and internal living space.
9. Just as important is the visual impact and sheer bulk and scale of the proposed development from our perspective. To this point, we feel the assessment mostly addresses the view from the streetscape and adjoining 2 properties on Woolgoolga and still doesn't genuinely consider the perspectives of the multiple downstream properties. From this viewpoint, it's very clear that it will be a massive 4 storey building overlooking and overshadowing these properties.
10. Specific to our property, the proposed building will cover two-thirds of our backyard, and at one point, will be 7.2m high within 1m of our rear boundary – our primary private open space.

11. By excessively pushing the maximum wall height and side boundary envelope, the proposed building will be visually dominant from all aspects of our primary private open space and from the public domain to the East.
12. It appears the assessment and report justify exceeding the maximum building and wall heights due to the challenging topography of the site; however, it would seem the extent of excavation required would remove any slope constraints. Also, the sheer size of the centre void clearly demonstrates that there is ample floor area space to accommodate a more compliant and mutually beneficial design.
13. To conclude, we appreciate council's efforts to try to minimise these impacts to date, however we feel these don't go far enough given the huge variations to the controls. We feel the council's report is trying to overcompensate for the naturally challenging site and accommodate the specific needs of 1 family at the expense of at least 5 surrounding families, leaving us to deal with the inevitable economic, social and health-related repercussions of such a non-compliant and imposing development.

As the residents most affected by access to sunlight and visual impact from the proposed development, we would like to achieve the following beneficial outcomes for our family:

- Full compliance with building and wall height controls to help improve our solar access.
- Full compliance with side boundary envelope controls by pushing the First Floor (from the South-East corner, 1m from our rear) further back towards the Second Floor and moving it further away from our rear boundary at the South-East corner to help minimise the visual impact from our property.