

---

**Sent:** 23/03/2019 1:56:50 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

23/03/2019

DR John Thirlwell  
1963 Pittwater RD  
Bayview NSW 2104  
johnthirlwell@gmail.com

**RE: DA2019/0154 - 1955 Pittwater Road BAYVIEW NSW 2104**

I have a number of objections to the proposed development in its current form:

Tree removal

According to Appendix 8 of the Arborist Report, every single tree within the boundaries of the site is scheduled to be removed. This is an issue for a couple of reasons. Firstly, it raises a discrepancy with the submitted documents - making the application misleading. On Plans - External and Landscape Plan Trees labeled 8,9, and 10 are to remain (which I encourage as a paperbark (Tree 10) is worth preserving in my opinion) directly contradicting Appendix 8 of the Arborist Report.

Secondly Pittwater DCP B4.22 states:

When a DA required for clearing vegetation the following requirements apply:

5. Development is to be sited and designed to minimise the impact on remnant native vegetation, including canopy trees and understorey vegetation, and on remnant native ground cover species.
6. Where the applicant demonstrates that no reasonable alternative design exists and a tree must be removed, suitable compensatory tree planting is required. Details including proposed species and the location of replacement planting are to be provided.
7. Development must also avoid any impact on trees on public land.
8. For development applications involving the construction of new buildings and works containing Classes 2-9 (BCA), the information contained in Appendix 18 (P21DCP) is to be submitted.

I don't believe that no suitable design alternative exists so that Tree 7 (ironbark) is unable to be retained. If Tree 7 is removed, when viewing the property from the north west, either from a neighbouring property such as ours, or from Pittwater Road heading east, there will be the unbroken façade of the proposed development which will have a massive impact on the streetscape, and is uncharacteristic of the area.

Privacy

Pittwater DCP C1.5 states:

Private open space areas including swimming pools and living rooms of proposed and any existing adjoining dwellings are to be protected from direct overlooking within 9 metres by building layout, landscaping, screening devices or greater spatial separation as shown in the diagram below (measured from a height of 1.7 metres above floor level).

Elevated decks and pools, verandahs and balconies should incorporate privacy screens where necessary and should be located at the front or rear of the building.

Direct views from an upper level dwelling shall be designed to prevent overlooking of more than 50% of the private open space of a lower level dwelling directly below.

#### DCP C1.7:

First floor balconies along the side boundary must be designed to limit overlooking and maintain privacy of adjoining residential properties.

The proposed roof terrace as part of Unit 4 should not be supported in its current form. As a minimum there should be the requirement for a privacy screen along the north-western boundary of this terrace. In its current form persons on the roof terrace can look straight onto all of the private open space of 1957 Pittwater Road, as well as into bedroom windows. While my property (1955) falls outside of the 9m mentioned in the control plan C1.5, due to the elevation of the proposed development we would lose a substantial amount of privacy should this proceed in its current form.

#### Parking and traffic

While the proposed development meets SEPP requirements in terms of car parking, it would be reckless to assess this issue without regard to the location of the property within a school zone. There is very limited parking for St Luke's Bayview on Loquat Valley Road, and in the school turning circle. A much more utilised location for school pick-up, drop-off and general parking is on Pittwater Road, and occurs directly outside this property, as well as to the immediate north west on Pittwater Road.

There is already significant congestion during and after school hours that this proposed development will just exacerbate.

#### Other considerations including bulk and scale

On the front page of the submitted Statement of Environmental Effects there is a photoshopped image of the proposed development and how it will look from the street. There are several issues with this image. Firstly, the streetlight post providing lighting for the corner of the road is missing, with no suggested replacement. This follows through on the Plans - External document where the retaining wall for the driveway is built on top of the streetlight post with no replacement streetlight shown on the plans.

Secondly the photo misleads the bulk and scale of the development by leaving trees 8 and 9 (Appendix 8 of Arborist Report) in situ screening a large portion of the north-western part of the building. According to the Arborist Report, these trees are to be removed, allowing the full bulk and scale of the building to be viewed from the street. The proposed plantings on the landscape plan are in no way sufficient to screen the development e.g. removing Tree 7 (ironbark) with a height of 22m, to be replaced by a Coastal Banksia with a final height of 5-10m.