
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 2/12/2024 11:08:43 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Online Submission

02/12/2024

MRS Vanessa Brown
88 / 88 - 88 ST
FRESHWATER NSW 2096
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2024/1501 - 90 Brighton Street FRESHWATER NSW 2096

Dear Claire,

We have lived at 88 Brighton St, since 2008 and I would like to make a submission regarding DA2024/1501: 90 Brighton St, Freshwater.

We are concerned about several elements, many of which are non-compliant, in the DA. We have had no interaction or discussions with the applicant or architects who have submitted the DA.

1. Size and Scale of the Development. Not in keeping with the existing neighbourhood.

The size and scale of the development is not in keeping with the style of Brighton St and surrounding areas. There are no developments on Brighton St, or surrounding streets of this size and scale of the proposed DA. It will make a dominant impact on the area and set a precedent. There are several battle-axe blocks in Brighton St, and our block has dual occupancy. However, in all these instances the houses are no larger than two storeys, and for most of the houses situated on the back block is not visible from the street. They are discreet and compliant with the R2 Low-Density Zoning. The houses proposed for this DA will be three storeys, overwhelming and the second dwelling will be visible from the street. They are not in keeping with any other blocks or houses on Brighton St.

2. Height

The height of both properties does not appear to be represented accurately on the plans, and DA submission. It states that both properties are within 8.5m high, but that's not possible for a 3-storey house. It appears, that the 8.5m has been calculated from the existing levels, not the proposed excavated levels. This is non-compliant. Three story houses combined with the topography of the block, will extenuate the size and scale of the two properties. The extreme height of both properties will result in shadows, reducing our access to sunlight and severe overlooking to our property.

3. Privacy

The size and height of the dwellings, particularly the second dwelling will significantly impact our privacy and make it very difficult enjoy our house and outside space.

4. Excavation & Stability

The proposed excavation is significant to the block and poses a risk to our property as identified in the Geotechnical report. There will be 5.1m of excavation at the front dwelling, 3.2m at the second dwelling, clearing the footprint for each house and 2.5m for each pool. This is significant and puts our properties at risk through vibration and excavation.

5. Trees and Tree Canopy

The DA will not be staying within the existing tree canopy. It will be significantly higher. Additionally, there will be at least 10 mature trees affected by the development which will have a significant impact on the tree canopy and local area. All these trees are > 4m and replacing them will be difficult.

Given the significant amount of development and extensive excavation work being squeezed onto two smaller plots, it feels quite optimistic to be able to establish TPZ and protect all the trees during building. The two mature gum trees > 10m should be protected at all costs.

6. Green Space

The two dwellings are a large footprint on plots which are below the compliant size. I would appreciate if Council could interrogate the green space ratios included in the DA. It does not appear possible to deliver a 40% ratio given the size and scale of the dwellings.

7. Side Boundary Envelope

We challenge the assumptions made in the DA regarding this non-compliant item. The size and bulk of the dwellings will affect access to light and encroach on our privacy. The plans should be drafted to be compliant to both West and East sides of the lot.

8. Non-Compliant Wall Height

The DA states that the West side of the properties are compliant, however due to the topography of the block, the Eastern side is not compliant. As an adjoining property, this will maximise rather than minimise the visual impact from our property. We propose that both the eastern and western side should be compliant, even if that means that the wall height is less than 7.2m on the Western side due to the topography of the block.

The breaching of wall heights will increase shadow on our property and decrease our access to sunlight.

We appreciate your thorough review of this DA and taking the points raised into consideration. Please contact us at any time to discuss further

Thanks,
Vanessa & Tony Brown

