
Sent: 11/01/2016 1:05:34 PM
Subject: DA objection - 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon - DA No: N0530/15
Attachments: Pittwater Objection letter - January 2016 - 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon.docx;
Pittwater Objection letter - January 2016 - 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon.docx;

Dear Erin

Please find attached my objection to the proposed subdivision at 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach. The DA is No: N0530/15.

I am currently having difficulty printing this document, so am emailing this to you and will drop in a copy of the same, along with the attachment and my signed submission form. Neither my printer or scanner are working currently.

Regards

Margarita Playoust-Colley
0418 498 880
6 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach.

This e-mail has been scanned for viruses by MCI's Internet Managed Scanning Services - powered by MessageLabs. For further information visit <http://www.mci.com>

The General Manager
Pittwater Council
PO Box 882
Mona Vale NSW 1660

6 Trentwood Park
Avalon Beach NSW 2107
7th January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

OBJECTION TO DA No: N0530/15
Proposed subdivision of 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach from 1 Lot into 3 Lots

I have studied the relevant documents pertaining to this Development Application at 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach and again write to express strong opposition to the proposed subdivision from 1 to 3 lots at this location. The final outcome of the application has massive environmental impact, does not meet Pittwater LEP's and DCP's on some accounts; and is clearly an unacceptable development that is not complimentary to the surrounds – both natural and built. The matter of greatest concern is the irreversible effects and detrimental damage to a natural vegetation and bush setting that will definitely occur on land that should be protected and preserved for generations to come.

I request that all councillors and planners advising and deliberating on this development application should visit the site and surrounds to grasp the impact of this proposal.

Many of the concerns raised in my previous two objection letters of August 2014 and January 2015 in relation to sub-division/development of this property still stand; along with the following.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

WILDLIFE CORRIDOR

Pittwater Local Government Area – Pittwater 21 DCP – Wildlife Corridor Map & Legend

Our residence at No 6 Trentwood Park is cut in half with two zones:

- 1 – HP - High Priority areas essential to fauna movement
- 2 – C01 - Those areas though disturbed are likely to be of habitat value due to good crown cover and/or understory

The proposed sub-division land at 7 Trentwood Park immediately joins our land, and while in majority is zoned C01 for Wildlife Corridor, I particularly note that the eastern corner of this land, which is proposed as Lot 1 in the new subdivision, is classed HP – high priority – as a wildlife corridor. (See attached).

The proposed subdivision of this land will have a massive impact on the natural environment and its thriving ecosystem; and will ultimately lead, particularly on Lot 1, to almost entire clearing of the current mostly native forest vegetation.

This seems a very unsatisfactory outcome in terms of preservation of wildlife corridors.

ARBORIST REPORT

While very thorough in its presentation, I feel the information presented in the Arborist Report is misleading, in terms of the overall impact on the environment once both subdivision and building works are completed. This report clearly states that “Further tree assessment will be required for future DA’s for houses on the individual lots. It is likely that additional tree removals will be required in Lot 1 at the house DA stage.”

It is fair and reasonable to assume that if one intends to subdivide a block of land into smaller lots, then the natural follow through is to sell off those lots, thus leading to their development in the future. Therefore account must be taken of the end result of development, not just the subdivision works itself. Impact of building works, building footprint, driveway and parking facilities, landscaping, provision of amenities and services – must also be considered. So, to note that only 48 trees (many of which are of High and Medium Retention Value) have been assessed on a site previously noted as having 132 trees across the entire site, most of which are in good condition, is misleading for the environmental impact full development of these lots would produce. For example, according to the Bluegum Arboricultural Impact Assessment, when Lot 1 in the proposal is developed, a further 9-12 trees would be removed, thus almost decimating the natural vegetation – both upper and lower canopies of this land and wildlife corridor.

This is not a satisfactory outcome.

The arborist report recommends “consultation with neighbouring tree owners” of trees 19, 20, 21, (22), 23 and 24. On no occasion thus far, have we been approached to discuss the impact of this work. The impact, should tree damage and loss occur, to the tree canopy on the north eastern property boundary is substantial, not to mention associated risk of damaged trees falling – which given the gradient of the land, according to three separate arborists I have met with, would mean any tree that has its roots destabilized would most likely fall in the eastern direction of the downhill slope, endangering not only our outhouse/cubbyhouse, but threatening our home itself. This failure to consult with us regarding trees is a poor move in the interests of creating neighbourly support for the proposal.

It should be noted that the current fence line on the northern boundary between addresses 6 and 7 Trentwood Park does not sit on the true boundary line of the properties. The Adam Clerke Surveyors Pty Ltd draft plan (21/09/15) indicates the fence line. It is advisable that the fence should be relocated to sit on its true boundary line, so there is no misunderstanding for future road or driveway adjustments.

CONSERVATION AREA

The site in question is zoned E4 Environmental Living and through its adjoining boundary with its neighbour at 22 Ruskin Rowe, is classed as having contributory value with the Ruskin Rowe Conservation Area; and as such, has significance on the Heritage Map, Conservation Area 5 (E4). It also links into the Wildlife Corridor map, as noted above. Thus for both its wildlife and vegetation, the biodiversity of this site should be deemed worthy of preservation and protection, as these things are of significance and are enjoyed by the community at large.

GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION

I have read the Jack Hodgson Consultants Pty Limited Risk Analysis & Management Report for the proposed subdivision. The following questions arise:

- 1 The slope of the land remains an issue of concern. This report notes “*The slope rises moderately from the east at an average angle of some 16.7 degrees.*” This conveniently sits on the maximum gradient allowance per the control which stipulates “*A person shall not subdivide*”

land if the allotment(s) intended to be created have a slope in excess of 16.7 degrees (30%), measured between the highest and lowest points on any such allotment(s). However this gradient figure is challenged by information provided by Playoust Churcher Architects in their letter of August 2014, where their investigations indicate that **“the average slope of the site appears to be 17.8 degrees. The site is steep and does not appear to meet this requirement”**, with the slope being in excess of the control guideline. (Refer Playoust Churcher Architects letter 2014 attached). Will council conduct their own independent investigation related to this matter, to give assurance to neighbours in adjoining properties and to their own deliberations – that the figure being considered is accurate?

- 2 The Geotechnical report notes that *“The site is classed slip affected under Council’s Policy and H1 hazard. A failure of the slope across the property is a potential hazard.”* It also notes that *“No evidence of significant slope instability was identified during our inspection.”* That being said, I understand neighbouring property/s to the east have had issues with slip and water flow from the adjoining property at 7 Trentwood Park, but I will allow those individuals to comment further on this matter.
- 3 Water management related to storm water, subsurface drainage and ground run-off. At periods of high rainfall, there are definite points of total ground saturation across this area, that sometimes take several days to drain thoroughly. As Playoust Churcher Architects noted in their August 2014 letter, there will be a big effect on the environment with *“the change in stormwater and run-off catchment”* which *“will be significant, given the extent of the driveways and the affect the houses and hard surfaces will have on stormwater run-off.”* Luke Playoust. I noted that the Hodgson report recommends *“The future development of the subdivided lots will be subject to separate investigations and relevant inspections.”*

PROPOSED LOT 1

I am totally opposed to the Lot 1 subdivision and its future development. There are significant issues in relation to any subdivision of this particular lot, including:

1. Gradient and slope of the land requires confirmation – noting it is in an area zoned **“landslip”**;
2. Preservation of landmark trees across the site, related to both subdivision and future development outcomes –noting that under the current DA it is indicated that 12++ trees would be removed from the upper canopy, along with destruction of lower vegetation, to complete driveway, easement, services and building. Disturbance of the primary root zones of the two magnificent landmark Coastal Angophora on this site could also lead to their demise. Many of the trees affected by this proposal are native species that are listed as protected trees in Pittwater. The vegetation and forest of the site will basically be obliterated. This will significantly change the cul-de-sac streetscape enjoyed by all Trentwood Park residents; and will have massive impact on vista and environment for all adjoining properties – to their detriment.
3. Guidelines for standards, outcomes and controls for both subdivision and subdivision design. We have major concerns over the building envelope for set-backs and compliance for the proposed house zone on lot 1, and note the massive detrimental effect the current proposal will have on the adjoining residents and property at 8 Trentwood Park – significantly diminishing their lifestyle, property and inherent value. Site restrictions such as narrow street frontage, steep gradient, tree preservation, building set-backs, easements, right of carriageways, driveway access and parking - will result in the construction of an unacceptable house development on Lot 1 that is NOT CHARACTERISTIC to the area. Is the *“minimum area for building of 175 square metres”* achievable in a fashion that is sympathetic to the environment and character of the locality? NO.

4. There are multiple questions regarding compliance in this area, as raised in the Frost submission on building controls in PLEP (refer Frost submission – January 2016);
5. Drive access to/from Lot 1 has not been indicated. Adding another drive into an already busy access point will create further hazards and safety issues. There are already three houses that reverse out onto the street somewhat ‘blindly’, let alone adding more cars into the mix. There has already been one collision, and a few near misses. A house on Lot 1 will make this even more precarious!

As the Curtin report notes in its summary on the impact of this proposal, *“There is a reduction both visual and acoustic, loss of view, loss of ambience and an adverse impact on the existing streetscape”*. (Lionel Curtin Report, commissioned by M & J Frost on the 2015 DA on the same site).

GENERAL COMMENTS

The land under submission is zoned Residential E4 - **Environmental living**. The 2014 Development Control Plan states specific outcomes and controls, pertaining to subdivision in low density residential areas. I believe several of the **outcomes** and **controls are not met** with this proposal, making this DA non-compliant with Pittwater Council Development guidelines. I raise the following points:

In relation to desired planning **Outcomes**:

1. *“Maintenance of the existing environment”* - Under the proposed subdivision, it is impossible to maintain the existing environment, on a block dominated today by vegetation classified as ‘forest’. Further environmental impacts include:
 - A substantial portion of the existing environment will be demolished in order to undergo construction and to provide essential services and a substantial driveway that would adequately service houses and families therein. This seems to be in contradiction with Development Control Plan B4.22 Preservation of Trees or Bushland Vegetation.
 - According to the original arborist report pertaining to this land subdivision posed in 2014 and again in 2015, there are approximately 132 trees across the site, most of which are in good condition (c 107 trees) and most of which are listed as protected in Pittwater area, like the Coastal Angophora, Cheese trees, Cabbage Tree Palms, Native Daphne, White Mahogany, bloodwood, turpentine, and other gum tree species.
 - The primary root zones of many major trees would have to be interrupted by construction, excavation and provision of services, which is non-compliant with regulation. (Refer comments on Playoust Churcher Architects letter, 2014.)
 - The area is home to many species of birds (including the Powerful Owl), reptiles, insects, green tree snakes, green tree frogs, long nosed bandicoots, mopokes, possums, brush turkeys and other native animals that treat this area as home. They are part of the natural environment and the wildlife corridor that this DA poses to destroy.
 - The letter of objection from Pittwater Natural Heritage Association supports these views around unacceptable destruction of the natural environment and its impact on wildlife and the adjoining conservation area of Ruskin Rowe.
2. *“The built form does not dominate the natural setting”* – The built form, along with the potential consequences of adjoining property tree loss and canopy reduction, will certainly mean the built form will dominate Lot 1 on what today is 100% vegetation.
3. *“Population density does not exceed the capacity of local and regional infrastructure and community services.”* - The increased population density will:
 - a) Increase traffic; raising issues around:
 - safe driveway access, usage & drive to street access, which are already hazardous;

- b) There will be substantial impact to the existing cul-de-sac quality of Trentwood Park, effectively making it like a through street rather than a cul-de-sac, with increased traffic flow. This will not only pose safety issues but has ramifications to the civilian environment where neighbours frequently gather and children play almost daily. The cul-de-sac is a major and positive lifestyle feature we all enjoy living with at this end of Trentwood Park.

Driveway issues – access to lots 2 and 3

A compliant driveway to service all lots is essential. While I note this proposal has made adjustments to the driveway access by including “*an additional passing bay and reduced slopes*” (refer Planning For Bushfire Protection letter dated 2/12/2015), there must be increased impact on tree drip and root zones should the drive gradient be lessened, as I assume this means more excavation work which impacts vegetation further.

I note again that the current drive already poses access challenges in prolonged wet periods for the existing residents. Delivery trucks park at the bottom of the drive or in the no-standing zone of the cul-de-sac to make deliveries, as it can be impassable in slippery wet weather. This driveway is already unsatisfactory, let alone increase the traffic flow on it three-fold.

Can council confirm that the driveway proposed in this DA is compliant and appropriately addresses all issues such as gradient, width, passing lanes, stormwater run-off and cost of construction for subdivision to proceed? And that provision of easements for services is also clearly addressed?

IN SUMMARY

Environmentally, this area should be listed for preservation, not development. It forms part of a wildlife corridor that the larger community enjoys; it contains many trees worthy of preservation; and it also adjoins **the heritage precinct** of Ruskin Rowe and Chisolm Avenue, which is listed in **Pittwater’s Most Scenic Streets Register**. We reside in the Harry Seidler “Hogbin House” at 6 Trentwood Park, which is a piece of Australia’s architectural history. The surrounds of this area form part of this history and environmental setting. Surely such classifications and facts make this area unique and worth protection?

This subdivision proposal will impact all adjoining blocks on Trentwood Park, Chisolm Avenue and Ruskin Rowe. It will have a negative impact on the inherent value of all these adjoining properties. We **do not support its approval**.

Points raised in the original Playoust Churcher Architects objection letter of 2014 pertaining to subdivision of this land still stand, and provide professional supporting evidence that this subdivision is unacceptable, non-compliant and should not proceed. (This letter is attached here.)

Irreversible changes to the landscape will occur should this DA be approved.

As I requested above, again I ask that all counsellors and planners advising and deliberating on this DA visit the site and surrounds to grasp the impact of this development.

To conclude, the proposed development does not meet Pittwater Council development criteria and severely impacts the environment associated with both Trentwood Park and Chisolm Avenue. I ask you to please seriously consider the concerns and issues raised by every neighbour in relation to this DA.

Yours Faithfully

Margarita Playoust-Colley & John Colley
6 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach NSW 2107

Mobile: 0418 498 880 Email: mplayoust@aehgroup.com.au

The General Manager
Pittwater Council
PO Box 882
Mona Vale NSW 1660

6 Trentwood Park
Avalon Beach NSW 2107
7th January 2016

Dear Sir/Madam

OBJECTION TO DA No: N0530/15
Proposed subdivision of 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach from 1 Lot into 3 Lots

I have studied the relevant documents pertaining to this Development Application at 7 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach and again write to express strong opposition to the proposed subdivision from 1 to 3 lots at this location. The final outcome of the application has massive environmental impact, does not meet Pittwater LEP's and DCP's on some accounts; and is clearly an unacceptable development that is not complimentary to the surrounds – both natural and built. The matter of greatest concern is the irreversible effects and detrimental damage to a natural vegetation and bush setting that will definitely occur on land that should be protected and preserved for generations to come.

I request that all councillors and planners advising and deliberating on this development application should visit the site and surrounds to grasp the impact of this proposal.

Many of the concerns raised in my previous two objection letters of August 2014 and January 2015 in relation to sub-division/development of this property still stand; along with the following.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

WILDLIFE CORRIDOR

Pittwater Local Government Area – Pittwater 21 DCP – Wildlife Corridor Map & Legend

Our residence at No 6 Trentwood Park is cut in half with two zones:

- 1 – HP - High Priority areas essential to fauna movement
- 2 – C01 - Those areas though disturbed are likely to be of habitat value due to good crown cover and/or understory

The proposed sub-division land at 7 Trentwood Park immediately joins our land, and while in majority is zoned C01 for Wildlife Corridor, I particularly note that the eastern corner of this land, which is proposed as Lot 1 in the new subdivision, is classed HP – high priority – as a wildlife corridor. (See attached).

The proposed subdivision of this land will have a massive impact on the natural environment and its thriving ecosystem; and will ultimately lead, particularly on Lot 1, to almost entire clearing of the current mostly native forest vegetation.

This seems a very unsatisfactory outcome in terms of preservation of wildlife corridors.

ARBORIST REPORT

While very thorough in its presentation, I feel the information presented in the Arborist Report is misleading, in terms of the overall impact on the environment once both subdivision and building works are completed. This report clearly states that “Further tree assessment will be required for future DA’s for houses on the individual lots. It is likely that additional tree removals will be required in Lot 1 at the house DA stage.”

It is fair and reasonable to assume that if one intends to subdivide a block of land into smaller lots, then the natural follow through is to sell off those lots, thus leading to their development in the future. Therefore account must be taken of the end result of development, not just the subdivision works itself. Impact of building works, building footprint, driveway and parking facilities, landscaping, provision of amenities and services – must also be considered. So, to note that only 48 trees (many of which are of High and Medium Retention Value) have been assessed on a site previously noted as having 132 trees across the entire site, most of which are in good condition, is misleading for the environmental impact full development of these lots would produce. For example, according to the Bluegum Arboricultural Impact Assessment, when Lot 1 in the proposal is developed, a further 9-12 trees would be removed, thus almost decimating the natural vegetation – both upper and lower canopies of this land and wildlife corridor.

This is not a satisfactory outcome.

The arborist report recommends “consultation with neighbouring tree owners” of trees 19, 20, 21, (22), 23 and 24. On no occasion thus far, have we been approached to discuss the impact of this work. The impact, should tree damage and loss occur, to the tree canopy on the north eastern property boundary is substantial, not to mention associated risk of damaged trees falling – which given the gradient of the land, according to three separate arborists I have met with, would mean any tree that has its roots destabilized would most likely fall in the eastern direction of the downhill slope, endangering not only our outhouse/cubbyhouse, but threatening our home itself. This failure to consult with us regarding trees is a poor move in the interests of creating neighbourly support for the proposal.

It should be noted that the current fence line on the northern boundary between addresses 6 and 7 Trentwood Park does not sit on the true boundary line of the properties. The Adam Clerke Surveyors Pty Ltd draft plan (21/09/15) indicates the fence line. It is advisable that the fence should be relocated to sit on its true boundary line, so there is no misunderstanding for future road or driveway adjustments.

CONSERVATION AREA

The site in question is zoned E4 Environmental Living and through its adjoining boundary with its neighbour at 22 Ruskin Rowe, is classed as having contributory value with the Ruskin Rowe Conservation Area; and as such, has significance on the Heritage Map, Conservation Area 5 (E4). It also links into the Wildlife Corridor map, as noted above. Thus for both its wildlife and vegetation, the biodiversity of this site should be deemed worthy of preservation and protection, as these things are of significance and are enjoyed by the community at large.

GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION

I have read the Jack Hodgson Consultants Pty Limited Risk Analysis & Management Report for the proposed subdivision. The following questions arise:

- 1 The slope of the land remains an issue of concern. This report notes “*The slope rises moderately from the east at an average angle of some 16.7 degrees.*” This conveniently sits on the maximum gradient allowance per the control which stipulates “*A person shall not subdivide*”

land if the allotment(s) intended to be created have a slope in excess of 16.7 degrees (30%), measured between the highest and lowest points on any such allotment(s). However this gradient figure is challenged by information provided by Playoust Churcher Architects in their letter of August 2014, where their investigations indicate that **“the average slope of the site appears to be 17.8 degrees. The site is steep and does not appear to meet this requirement”**, with the slope being in excess of the control guideline. (Refer Playoust Churcher Architects letter 2014 attached). Will council conduct their own independent investigation related to this matter, to give assurance to neighbours in adjoining properties and to their own deliberations – that the figure being considered is accurate?

- 2 The Geotechnical report notes that *“The site is classed slip affected under Council’s Policy and H1 hazard. A failure of the slope across the property is a potential hazard.”* It also notes that *“No evidence of significant slope instability was identified during our inspection.”* That being said, I understand neighbouring property/s to the east have had issues with slip and water flow from the adjoining property at 7 Trentwood Park, but I will allow those individuals to comment further on this matter.
- 3 Water management related to storm water, subsurface drainage and ground run-off. At periods of high rainfall, there are definite points of total ground saturation across this area, that sometimes take several days to drain thoroughly. As Playoust Churcher Architects noted in their August 2014 letter, there will be a big effect on the environment with *“the change in stormwater and run-off catchment”* which *“will be significant, given the extent of the driveways and the affect the houses and hard surfaces will have on stormwater run-off.”* Luke Playoust. I noted that the Hodgson report recommends *“The future development of the subdivided lots will be subject to separate investigations and relevant inspections.”*

PROPOSED LOT 1

I am totally opposed to the Lot 1 subdivision and its future development. There are significant issues in relation to any subdivision of this particular lot, including:

1. Gradient and slope of the land requires confirmation – noting it is in an area zoned **“landslip”**;
2. Preservation of landmark trees across the site, related to both subdivision and future development outcomes –noting that under the current DA it is indicated that 12++ trees would be removed from the upper canopy, along with destruction of lower vegetation, to complete driveway, easement, services and building. Disturbance of the primary root zones of the two magnificent landmark Coastal Angophora on this site could also lead to their demise. Many of the trees affected by this proposal are native species that are listed as protected trees in Pittwater. The vegetation and forest of the site will basically be obliterated. This will significantly change the cul-de-sac streetscape enjoyed by all Trentwood Park residents; and will have massive impact on vista and environment for all adjoining properties – to their detriment.
3. Guidelines for standards, outcomes and controls for both subdivision and subdivision design. We have major concerns over the building envelope for set-backs and compliance for the proposed house zone on lot 1, and note the massive detrimental effect the current proposal will have on the adjoining residents and property at 8 Trentwood Park – significantly diminishing their lifestyle, property and inherent value. Site restrictions such as narrow street frontage, steep gradient, tree preservation, building set-backs, easements, right of carriageways, driveway access and parking - will result in the construction of an unacceptable house development on Lot 1 that is NOT CHARACTERISTIC to the area. Is the *“minimum area for building of 175 square metres”* achievable in a fashion that is sympathetic to the environment and character of the locality? NO.

4. There are multiple questions regarding compliance in this area, as raised in the Frost submission on building controls in PLEP (refer Frost submission – January 2016);
5. Drive access to/from Lot 1 has not been indicated. Adding another drive into an already busy access point will create further hazards and safety issues. There are already three houses that reverse out onto the street somewhat ‘blindly’, let alone adding more cars into the mix. There has already been one collision, and a few near misses. A house on Lot 1 will make this even more precarious!

As the Curtin report notes in its summary on the impact of this proposal, *“There is a reduction both visual and acoustic, loss of view, loss of ambience and an adverse impact on the existing streetscape”*. (Lionel Curtin Report, commissioned by M & J Frost on the 2015 DA on the same site).

GENERAL COMMENTS

The land under submission is zoned Residential E4 - **Environmental living**. The 2014 Development Control Plan states specific outcomes and controls, pertaining to subdivision in low density residential areas. I believe several of the **outcomes** and **controls are not met** with this proposal, making this DA non-compliant with Pittwater Council Development guidelines. I raise the following points:

In relation to desired planning **Outcomes**:

1. *“Maintenance of the existing environment”* - Under the proposed subdivision, it is impossible to maintain the existing environment, on a block dominated today by vegetation classified as ‘forest’. Further environmental impacts include:
 - A substantial portion of the existing environment will be demolished in order to undergo construction and to provide essential services and a substantial driveway that would adequately service houses and families therein. This seems to be in contradiction with Development Control Plan B4.22 Preservation of Trees or Bushland Vegetation.
 - According to the original arborist report pertaining to this land subdivision posed in 2014 and again in 2015, there are approximately 132 trees across the site, most of which are in good condition (c 107 trees) and most of which are listed as protected in Pittwater area, like the Coastal Angophora, Cheese trees, Cabbage Tree Palms, Native Daphne, White Mahogany, bloodwood, turpentine, and other gum tree species.
 - The primary root zones of many major trees would have to be interrupted by construction, excavation and provision of services, which is non-compliant with regulation. (Refer comments on Playoust Churcher Architects letter, 2014.)
 - The area is home to many species of birds (including the Powerful Owl), reptiles, insects, green tree snakes, green tree frogs, long nosed bandicoots, mopokes, possums, brush turkeys and other native animals that treat this area as home. They are part of the natural environment and the wildlife corridor that this DA poses to destroy.
 - The letter of objection from Pittwater Natural Heritage Association supports these views around unacceptable destruction of the natural environment and its impact on wildlife and the adjoining conservation area of Ruskin Rowe.
2. *“The built form does not dominate the natural setting”* – The built form, along with the potential consequences of adjoining property tree loss and canopy reduction, will certainly mean the built form will dominate Lot 1 on what today is 100% vegetation.
3. *“Population density does not exceed the capacity of local and regional infrastructure and community services.”* - The increased population density will:
 - a) Increase traffic; raising issues around:
 - safe driveway access, usage & drive to street access, which are already hazardous;

- b) There will be substantial impact to the existing cul-de-sac quality of Trentwood Park, effectively making it like a through street rather than a cul-de-sac, with increased traffic flow. This will not only pose safety issues but has ramifications to the civilian environment where neighbours frequently gather and children play almost daily. The cul-de-sac is a major and positive lifestyle feature we all enjoy living with at this end of Trentwood Park.

Driveway issues – access to lots 2 and 3

A compliant driveway to service all lots is essential. While I note this proposal has made adjustments to the driveway access by including “*an additional passing bay and reduced slopes*” (refer Planning For Bushfire Protection letter dated 2/12/2015), there must be increased impact on tree drip and root zones should the drive gradient be lessened, as I assume this means more excavation work which impacts vegetation further.

I note again that the current drive already poses access challenges in prolonged wet periods for the existing residents. Delivery trucks park at the bottom of the drive or in the no-standing zone of the cul-de-sac to make deliveries, as it can be impassable in slippery wet weather. This driveway is already unsatisfactory, let alone increase the traffic flow on it three-fold.

Can council confirm that the driveway proposed in this DA is compliant and appropriately addresses all issues such as gradient, width, passing lanes, stormwater run-off and cost of construction for subdivision to proceed? And that provision of easements for services is also clearly addressed?

IN SUMMARY

Environmentally, this area should be listed for preservation, not development. It forms part of a wildlife corridor that the larger community enjoys; it contains many trees worthy of preservation; and it also adjoins **the heritage precinct** of Ruskin Rowe and Chisolm Avenue, which is listed in **Pittwater’s Most Scenic Streets Register**. We reside in the Harry Seidler “Hogbin House” at 6 Trentwood Park, which is a piece of Australia’s architectural history. The surrounds of this area form part of this history and environmental setting. Surely such classifications and facts make this area unique and worth protection?

This subdivision proposal will impact all adjoining blocks on Trentwood Park, Chisolm Avenue and Ruskin Rowe. It will have a negative impact on the inherent value of all these adjoining properties. We **do not support its approval**.

Points raised in the original Playoust Churcher Architects objection letter of 2014 pertaining to subdivision of this land still stand, and provide professional supporting evidence that this subdivision is unacceptable, non-compliant and should not proceed. (This letter is attached here.)

Irreversible changes to the landscape will occur should this DA be approved.

As I requested above, again I ask that all counsellors and planners advising and deliberating on this DA visit the site and surrounds to grasp the impact of this development.

To conclude, the proposed development does not meet Pittwater Council development criteria and severely impacts the environment associated with both Trentwood Park and Chisolm Avenue. I ask you to please seriously consider the concerns and issues raised by every neighbour in relation to this DA.

Yours Faithfully

Margarita Playoust-Colley & John Colley
6 Trentwood Park, Avalon Beach NSW 2107

Mobile: 0418 498 880 Email: mplayoust@aehgroup.com.au