
Sent: 21/01/2021 4:54:21 PM
Subject: Online Submission

21/01/2021

MR Ken Smith
12 - Courtley Road ST
Beacon Hill NSW 2100
ken@vmxmag.com.au

RE: DA2020/1606 - 10 Courtley Road BEACON HILL NSW 2100

Penny Wood
Northern Beaches Council

Dear Ms Wood

Re: DA2020/1606 - 10 Courtley Road, Beacon Hill

I wish to object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

1. Rear Boundary Setback - it is considered that the proposed 2m width that has now been provided for landscaping will not support much, if any, grass or other landscaping. The proposed rear landscaped area is on the south side of a very large building and 'boxed in' by a retaining wall that is almost 2m in height. All that will grow in this strip will be moss.
2. Excavation and landfill - on p7 of the SEE, it states that Council requested at a pre-DA meeting that the north-east corner of the site be returned to pre-existing ground levels to ensure the development reduces its visual impact and to ensure no adverse privacy impacts to adjoining dwellings. The applicant's response in the SEE states that - "When comparing the pre-existing levels to the current levels, there is no material difference that would increase privacy issues to the eastern neighbour." That statement is an utter nonsense! A quick look at Figure 3 on p4 of the SEE demonstrates without doubt that the amount of fill in the north-east corner is substantial. If someone was standing at the new level, their knees would be at the height of the TOP of the boundary fence. Council's advice and request made at the pre-DA meeting should be carried out in any future development on this site.
3. Excavation and landfill on the submitted plans - it is noted that plans noted as Elevations 01 & 02, and, 02 & 04, plus plans noted as Section A & B, all refer to 'Natural Ground Level' when in fact that is incorrect. The level shown as 'Natural Ground Level' is the excavated level and in some cases almost 2m different than the correct natural ground level. This just tries to gloss over the fact that a massive amount of excavation and fill was carried out illegally and that somehow the site now magically has an almost flat building platform. The plans should give an honest and accurate 'Natural Ground Level'.
4. Landscaped Open Space - it is considered that although the applicant claims to have substantially improved the landscaped area over the seriously deficient plan shown at the pre-DA meeting (as noted in the SEE on p7) that the rear landscaped area will still be impractical for that purpose due to its almost total lack of sunlight. Therefore it seems probable that the proposal will still be deficient in providing the required amount of usable and practical

landscaped open space.

5. Privacy - the pre-DA meeting made a very pointed reference to the alfresco deck on the eastern boundary, recommending that it be setback at least 2m from the boundary. This has not been done and instead, a privacy screen has been added. The privacy screen will provide zero privacy to our backyard and pool as the screen doesn't even reach eye level of people standing on that alfresco deck - they can just look straight over the top of the screen. In any event, a privacy screen is a stop-gap measure, the deck needs to be reduced at that north-eastern corner and be sited further away from the boundary. As well, it is considered appropriate that advanced screening be planted along the northern half of the eastern boundary. This front 'corner' of No. 10 is planned to receive more fill and then a 1m high retaining wall erected, so that this whole corner will be considerably above the natural ground line and anyone using this grassed area will likely have the top of the boundary fence at their waist height, giving rise to considerable overlooking. Similarly, there are very large picture windows on the first and second level in the front, eastern elevation of the proposed dwelling which will also directly overlook our pool and private open space.

6. Front setback area - another variation is sought for the front setback, which is now required as the development has been pushed further towards the front boundary to try and meet the landscaped open space requirement.

7. Overdevelopment of the site - the applicant states numerous times that the site is irregular in shape and uses that as justification for non-compliance with the front and rear setbacks and to support their rejection of Council's advice in regard to the setback of the alfresco deck on the eastern boundary. The applicant also states that the topography of the site is a unique constraint. It is now an almost flat site due to the substantial and illegal excavation and fill carried out by the applicant - there are now few topographical constraints! Together, the need to 'flatten' the site and request significant allowances for front and rear setbacks all point to the fact that the site isn't suitable for a five-bedroom project home of these proportions. The proposed house is quite simply too large for the (irregular) site. Yes, the site is irregular, perhaps it might be a better idea to design a house that fits comfortably on an irregular site, which was sloping, rather than just trying to force a project home to somehow fit on the site.

Finally, I would like to request a meeting with Ms Wood prior to the determination of the DA to discuss my concerns while referencing the submitted plans.