
Sent: 21/09/2017 10:43:55 AM
Subject: FW: DA Objection on No 7 Trentwood Park - September 2017 objection
Attachments: 7 Trentwood Park DA Objection Letter_19 Sept 2017.docx;

From: Margarita Playoust [mailto:mplayoust@aehgroup.com.au]
Sent: Wednesday, 20 September 2017 12:01 PM
To: Council Mailbox
Subject: DA Objection on No 7 Trentwood Park - September 2017 objection

To whom it may concern

Please note the previous email was a copy of my objection to this DA project from 2015. It contains many relevant issues that should be considered when you access the more recent DA No530/15 on the same block of land.

Please refer to the attachment here for an objection on the new proposed DA.

Regards

Margarita Playoust-Colley
0418 498 880

Northern Beaches Council

ATTENTION - ANGELA MANAHAN

Principal Planner

18th September 2017

Dear Ms Manahan

OBJECTION TO DA No530/15 at 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach

Please note the following concerns regarding this ongoing development application. Please also consider these issues, alongside previously raised issues in two letters of objection, many of which remain of concern.

1. GARBAGE BINS & FIRE HYDRANT PLACEMENT

I request that the developer be required to house their own garbage bins and facilities outside the immediate precinct of their own house. Not an unreasonable request! I am sure they can walk their wheelie-bins up and down the drive, like everyone else who lives on the beaches manages to do.

The current DA proposal to place all garbage bins and fire hydrant facilities at my front gate and letter box is rude, offensive and totally unnecessary. I live in a magnificent Harry Seidler home that is part of Australia's architectural history. I do not expect to drive up the street and have anybody's garbage bins parked at my front door. Given the owners of the block have approximately 5,500 square meters of land, I am sure they can be more respectful and gracious in dealing with their rubbish. A simple and neighbour friendly request.....they need a better solution here.

2. TREE REMOVAL AND LAND CLEARING ALREADY UNDERTAKEN – WITH OR WITHOUT PERMISSION?

I note that over the past 12 months or so there has been considerable clearing and chain-sawing conducted at fairly regular intervals on the land under question for DA. Was this clearing approved? While it is good to get rid of the copious quantities of weeds that were prevalent on the land, I have serious concerns for the upholding of the Environmental Zoning and the Wildlife Corridor that this land and area enjoys. Weed control – great! Clearing native trees – not good environmentally, and not good for the native wildlife that should be cared for and preserved.

I am also concerned about the impact of development on the tree root systems of various specimens on these blocks. Can you please advise neighbours from a professional perspective about the impact of both the new driveway proposed, and the house plans now submitted, that they meet council

requirements in relation to the tree root systems? Are council planners satisfied that this proposal meets their requirements?

3. WILDLIFE CORRIDOR

As noted above, the clearing of some of the vegetation and trees on the block must have already impacted the passage of wildlife in this area. There are some particular species in our community that are worth protecting, such as the Powerful Owl. Another such species is the Feathertail glider. The children at our local school are currently undertaking a magnificent research project, along with the support of both Northern Beaches Council and Taronga Zoo, to research and preserve the needs of the local habit required for this little creature's ongoing survival and well being. This is just one example of why our wildlife corridors are important ecologically and worth preserving.

4. FIRE HAZARD & EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS

Of course concerns remain about the fire hazard risks associated with this area. The recent extremely dry winter period highlights this. I was of the understanding that to comply with safety standards, this subdivision proposal was required to provide a driveway that:

- Was sufficient to carry emergency vehicles
- Had an adequate passing bay, to cater for its own traffic flow, let alone in the case of an emergency, for emergency vehicle access
- Had a turning bay area for cars and emergency vehicles
- Provides adequate access to water points/fire hydrant

Is the Fire Department satisfied that this proposal is compliant? As a neighbour and immediately adjoining property, I have the obvious concerns for the obvious reasons.

5. MERGING TRAFFIC ONTO CUL DE SAC & EXISTING HOUSES DRIVE ACCESS – PLUS INCREASED TRAFFIC

In their favour, the current plans have failed to adequately show driveways from existing houses adjoining the cul-de-sac and merging into the one shared space. There are currently 5 houses which immediately access the cul-de-sac, plus two more houses on its periphery. This equates, at a minimum, to 10 cars plus. By lay of the land, many of these cars currently reverse onto the street. There have already been several 'near miss' experiences and at least one collision that I am aware of. Adding another 2 houses to the mix will increase the hazard ie 4 more cars at least (noting that most homes in this area have 2 cars/drivers or more). Slow and careful access is always required – for safety reasons, and particularly given a large number of children live in many of the houses at this end of the street.

The increase in traffic along our boundary – that will occur should this DA be approved – is not particularly palatable! We are fortunate enough to reside in a bushy setting that is extremely peaceful by majority. I do not look forward to the increase in cars, noise pollution, headlights into our home, nor the speed at which these vehicles already navigate the drive. Yes – increased traffic is part of life, but not one I look forward to on my fence line.

6. DRIVEWAY – SAFETY RAILS

It appears that part of the driveway is elevated in the proposal, to access the rear block. Can you please confirm that adequate safety rails will be installed in its construction, should a car misjudge the drive or an accident occur at any time. Can you also please advise whether the proposed driveway is compliant in terms of gradient, passing lanes, width and access.

Please note that the current fence line on the southern boundary between no 6 and no 7 Trentwood Park does not sit on the true boundary of those properties. It should be relocated, in part, at least 1 meter towards the No 7 driveway.

7. ACCESS FOR LOT 3 TO CHISOLM ROAD FROM EXISTING DRIVEWAYS AT CHISOLM

Looking at the logical lay of the land in the proposed subdivision, it makes best sense that the house and Lot 3 proposed subdivision is best served by accessing the already existing driveways in very close proximity, to the west along Chisolm Road. I understand why adjoining houses at that end of the proposal may be resistant to this idea, but it seems the most logical approach. Is there any possibility of the developer further investigating this opportunity?

Such an outcome would be better for traffic flow along the current driveway proposed, and be better for traffic management at the cul-de-sac.

8. PROPOSED HOUSE ON LOT 1

The proposed house on Lot 1 will grossly impact the amenity of the existing home at Number 8 Trentwood Park. It appears to be a very large dwelling, sitting immediately on top of the adjoining home, overshadowing and blocking their aspect from their western windows, living spaces and garden; and imposing on them a loss of privacy, with immediate sight lines into their living spaces.

It is completely understandable why they might object to this Lot 1 subdivision in its entirety. It decreases the value of their home by dollar value and by privacy. It puts at risk the magnificent landmark Coastal Angophora at the streets end. It increases traffic safety issues at the cul-de-sac by adding another driveway into an already crowded and hazardous space. It is a narrow and steep block, with a large house proposed on a small block. Does this plan meet council building codes, set-back requirements etc; and is this proposal compliant in all areas required?

Thank you for your time and consideration of these concerns. It has been a longstanding DA that has extended over many years now. I hope these issues can be addressed in a satisfactory fashion, and one that works for all the neighbours and community in these surrounds. We have always been a very harmonious neighbourhood, but this proposal has caused great upset and concern amongst the local inhabitants – human and other!

Kind regards

Margarita Playoust-Colley

mplayoust@aeigroup.com.au

0418 498 880