
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 6/03/2024 12:14:44 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Online Submission

06/03/2024

MR Stuart Herring
16 / 605 - 611 Pittwater RD
Dee Why NSW 2099
[REDACTED]

RE: Mod2024/0048 - 615 Pittwater Road DEE WHY NSW 2099

As part of the case resolved by the land and environment court (Leech Harmon v Northern Beaches Council, 18 Dec 2019), resulting in the court approved plans, the applicant was granted leave to amend the plans to address a range of issues resulting in a final outcome that was considered far more reasonable and acceptable.

These new proposed changes grossly ignore the issues previously raised and addressed as part of this process, reverting to plans that are unconscionable including a substantial increase in building footprint and height that lacks in kind of consideration for the impacts on surrounding residents.

The key issues to raise include:

1. Excessive Height

- The additional floors added to the building result in 3 and even 4 stories buildings across the length of the development (up from just 2 previously) results in a wall height of 8.5m which breaches the maximum wall height of 7m.
- In addition the total height should not breach 8.5m, however the plans do not clearly indicate the height of the room (which has been greatly flattened, however given the wall height is already 8.5m, this will result in virtually the entire development breaching the maximum height of 8.5m.
- Given the slope of the site, the visual impact of these 3 story buildings is even greater than the 8.5m to 9m buildings creating an enormous imposing building that will tower over the surrounding properties.

2. Reduced access to natural light

- The townhouses to the south of the property in question run long ways north south meaning the primary source of natural sunlight is via the limited north facing aspect.
- The increase in height and bulk of these revised plans will have a significant impact on the light, beyond the impact of the shadow diagrams which indicates the removal of all sunlight

during the winter months.

3. Detrimental impact on Privacy

- The revised plans add an additional floor to Blocks B, C and D. This along with the increased length of these buildings and the addition of windows that directly face our main bedroom and that of our children's bedrooms amplify the impact of overlooking and will have a massive impact on privacy.
- Our only escape would be to keep blinds closed at all times which further impacts our access to natural light.
- In addition, we will lose any privacy in our backyard.
- The previous plans with the reduced height also were far more considerate with regards to the placement of windows and privacy screens to minimise the impact.

4. Appalling and uncharacteristic Bulk

- The proposal's bulk is excessive and scale is no longer compatible with the character of the area. The additional level to 3 and at times 4 levels is ridiculous in this land locked sited. All surrounding properties have a maximum of two stories which makes this completely incompatible with its surrounds.
- It removes all attempts by the previous amendments to address concerns and the requirements of the Warringah Development Control Plan to minimise the visual impact on adjoining properties. In particular they have:
 - Removed wall articulation and setbacks resulting in large areas of continuous wall planes which was a noted consideration of the previous approval
 - Ignored the impact of the sloping land, in particular minimising the height and bulk of the development on the downhill side to reduce the impact on adjoining neighbours.
- Increases the footprint of all building resulting in a development that has a circa 15% increase in footprint, including a 30% increase to building D.
- As a result it is no longer of a domestic scale and style, which again was a noted consideration of the previous approval.

5. Impact on Parking, Traffic and Safety

- As stated consistently, this excessive development proposal creates unnecessary risks in relation to traffic and parking.
- The slip road is not intended to handle this scale of development.
- The steep May Rd is narrow and faces east west resulting in blinding sun and is used as a rat run by motorists during peak hour making it extremely dangerous.

- The addition of further rooms and reduction of car spaces adds even further stress, which unfortunately seems to be a concern which is consistently ignored.

6. Detrimental impacts on low density areas

- While I understand that the initial application was lodged prior to the amendments to SEPP ARH to limit the total number of rooms in R2 zones, the changes to SEPP add weight to highlight the detrimental impact raised above that overdevelopment of these proposal has in low density areas.
- Given an approved application had been reached with the land and environment court, surely the intent of these SEPP amendments should have even further consideration on these requests to further modify the proposal development, particularly when they as significant as these proposed changes.