

Response to DA2020/0014

Lot 51 DP 740538

1772 Pittwater Road Bayview

From Ian McManamey, western neighbour

1778 Pittwater Road Bayview

My Concerns:

1. Waterfront Building Line Setback.

The proposal does not appear to meet the waterfront setback requirements.

There may be some confusion on the location of an apparent building line due to the fact that 1778 is located well to the north of a building line derived as a setback from the mean high-water mark. This is because 1778 resides on 2 titles, DP114923 and DP752046. DP752046, to the north, extends well beyond the mean high-water mark. As such the setback for 1778 comes from its seawall, not from the original mean high-water mark which was most probably located at the northern boundary of DP114923, the original subdivision DP. It seems likely that most of the properties to the east have, through land fill, retaining/seawall construction and sand build-up been shifting mean high water northward over the years.

2. Site Coverage.

It is unclear whether cantilever overhangs are, or should be, included in site coverage. Additionally, it is unclear whether the stairs leading from the pool area to the jetty, paving stones, garden paths and the driveway are landscape area or impervious area.

3. Side Boundary Envelope.

As noted, the proposal impinges on the envelope to both the east and west.

4. View Intrusion.

The view lines on the Level 1 and 2 diagrams are not shown to be perpendicular to the window pane, as such the computer-generated view scenarios are not accurate, the proposed building intrudes on the view more substantially than portrayed.

5. Living Room to Bedroom Intrusion.

Due to both the northward intrusion and the large western windows on the proposed 1st floor living room, a significant privacy intrusion into 1778's master bedroom and dressing room would result. An additional point noted is that the view from the proposed living room, NNW, towards Lion Island, will be impacted by the Livistona palms along the eastern side of 1778's boundary.

6. Shower Wall.

It is unclear as to why the outdoor shower needs to be shielded from view to the east and south but fully exposed to the west at a location adjacent to our eastern boundary. In addition, it is unclear why such a large wall with view reducing characteristics, is required to support a shower.

7. Fire Pit.

Our preference would be that the fire pit was not located directly next to our eastern boundary, however, we appreciate that it would most likely rarely be used with entertaining events occurring simultaneously at both properties.

8. Tree Removal.

We are concerned about the two Spotted Gums (*Corymbia maculata*), that were planted on the road verge outside 1772 many years ago. These trees are endemic to this area and important as bird habitat.