

For DA2020/0005

Lot BDP390788 1744 pittwater Rd Bayview 2104  
letter for submission to this current Application  
subdivision one lot to two.



**Owners**  
1746/1746A  
Pittwater Rd  
Bayview 2104  
Shelley Farriss  
Josephine Farriss  
Matthew Farriss

To Jordan Davies planner  
Impacts to our dwellings 1746/ 1746A Pittwater rd Bayview.

We have over the 20 yrs had a good working relationship  
with these neighbours.  
Unfortunately they didn't approach us about there plans and this  
notification was the first we new about this application.

**Listed issues with this Application.**

**No Geotechnical Report:** As per Councils engineers referral.  
which requires a geotechnical report to adequately assess the  
proposed subdivision

- **Detailed Stormwater Plans:** Including inter-allotment drainage details, as per Council engineers referral.
- **Arborist Report:** The survey indicates a number of trees on the site which will be impacted with the proposed development. Endangered spotted gum trees are located on the site. There are trees that will need to be removed that sit within the proposed building footprint which have not been assessed by a relevant professional. Furthermore, tree protection zones (TPZ) may be required to protect the retained trees and their root systems. This should be guided by a qualified arborist.

- A flora and fauna report should be undertaken as well considering the number of spotted gums and the E4 zoning.
- **Proposed building footprint:** The indicative footprints have not been
- adequately thought through. The plans show a simple square box as an indicative footprint with no consideration given to how well a future dwelling could comply with the planning controls.
- The footprint proposed for lot 1 sits within the required 10m front setback control within the DCP.
- The DCP clause states that the front setback along Pittwater Road should be 10m or follow the established building line, whichever is greater. Given that 1746A Pittwater Road had to comply with the 10m front setback for the new dwelling currently being constructed .
- it should be enforced with any future dwelling on lot 1 at 1744.
- **Request concept plans.** Any future dwellings on the site will have a significant impact on the amenity of our homes,
- In particular view impacts, privacy and overshadowing.
- The dwelling location for lot 2,
- meeting the foreshore building line setbacks .
- This will potentially obliterate highly valuable water views towards the East of our home.
- Without concept plans showing a building envelope it is impossible to determine the extent of this impact.
- Furthermore, the construction of my home in the 1980's was constrained in regard to the building height lessened by 2.5m to protect the views of the existing dwelling at 1744 across my property by the same owners that are applying for this application.
- The Architect for dwelling 1746 was able to design with an application to compensate for such height restrictions to the building height by designing the house to views across 1744 across the bay to the East as compensation for heavy design constraints from these objections & view protections made then.

- **Minimum lot width:** Lot 1 does not meet the 16m lot width control stipulated in the DCP.
- **Driveway:** As stated in Council's engineering referral response, the driveway is in excess of 40m and as such will require a passing bay 5m wide and 10m long. This requirement will impact on the lot sizes. The need for a passing bay will result in 1 of the proposed lots to be below the 700m<sup>2</sup>. This will require a formal clause 4.6 request to vary that development standard.

In summary

**We cannot support this application in any way as it stands.**

**We object strongly to this application**

**For the impact these lot positions and sizes will have on our homes.**

:Our subdivision consent Dated January 2010

:Our new building on our new allotment lot 1.

: We had 3066M2 to start with and a 31m street frontage.

: We met the guidelines and set backs and created a separate lot with separate driveway a turning area off Pittwater rd .


- Our building Lot 1 = 850m<sup>2</sup> ,We also met the set backs building lines and we submitted the relevant reports documentation Arborist reports protecting advanced trees to preserve the integrity of the site.
  - Building to the Arborists requests of tree protection zones in all cases as no major trees were impacted by our building because of our building applications that were strictly adhered to.
  - : before Pittwater local Environmental plan was adopted in 2014 (E4.)yet we were advised to apply with the more restricted guidelines being flagged in the future.
- Our application did not impact direct living Amenity to our direct Neighbours as this Application has the Potential to do.
- The subdivision allotment guidelines within the code .
  - The DCP /the LEP.
  -

- we have a generous buffer of 9 m to our west and 11 m to our East over our driveway to the nearest neighbour buildings.
- **Maximum impact**
- We object strongly to this subdivision as so much has not been thought through.

The proposed lot 2 will completely compromise constrain and directly effect our standard of living areas to our home of 20 yrs with views to the East hugely impacted and major living areas and bedrooms on ground floor for light.

- As the architects were forced to build underground due to the objections of these owners in the 1980's.
- They then wanted to protect their living area & views so do we want to protect our living area and views now on this submission.
- We all have a right to our amenity and we look to council to uphold these guidelines to protecting those controls.
- As we did ,when met by the rules with our application .
- we request this application is met with the same caution.
- Our subdivision took 3 yrs and \$250K
- A further 8 yrs to achieve a build under construction now.

Regards  
Owners  
shelley Farriss  
Josephine Farriss  
Matthew Farriss



07.02.2020