
Sent: 16/03/2021 4:09:26 PM
Subject: Attention Mr David Auster re:,DA 2021/0129 Development of 107 Frenchs Forest Road, Seaforth
Attachments: Andrews & Bruce Objection to DA2021-0129.docx;

Dear David,

Please find attached an outline of our objections for the planned redevelopment of the property at 107 Frenchs Forest Road, Seaforth 2092.

Please let me know if you have any questions,

Kind regards
Rhonda Andrews & Colin Bruce

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

To David Auster,
Planner
Northern Beaches Council.

Dear David,

We refer to the DA proposal currently before Council for the development of the property at 107 Frenchs Forest Road, Seaforth (DA 2021/0129)

We are the Owners/Occupiers of a neighbouring property at 80 Macmillan Street, Seaforth and as such are situated at the rear, west of the site of the proposed new dwelling.

The proposal currently before Council is we understand more than 10% non-compliant with many of the existing guidelines for new dwellings in the Seaforth area and there is a request from the developers in the form of Clause 4.6 Exception that the proposed non-compliant development be granted approval simply because the existing land area was at some time in the past affected by the widening of Frenchs Forest Road.

We have resided at this address for over 20 years and as such have seen many new developments in our local area however during this period, we do not believe that there has been any widening of Frenchs Forest Road and the property at 107 Frenchs Forest Road has retained the existing land area for many years.

Although, our property is not even mentioned to our knowledge in ANY of the documents attached to the proposal we believe that our property would be detrimentally environmentally impacted if the development was to be approved as submitted.

The key points for our objection to the proposal are:

Side area and rear setbacks: the proposed dwelling does not comply with the 1.9 metre side setbacks which are currently set at 2.2 on the west side of the existing dwelling. The west side setback is proposed to be reduced to 1.469 which is well under the regulated setback and allows no room for a sufficient breezeway nor for the landscaping requirements as outlined in the Council's Land Referral Response for which more detail to our objection is outlined below.

We also believe that the width of the proposed dwelling will be detrimental to the streetscape as the size of the dwelling is oversized for the land area, being greater than that of 30 sq metres over the regulated FSR.

The height of the proposed dwelling is compliant at 8.45 however the Ridge line of the roof is a massive 92.245 which considering the size of the land is simply overwhelming.

The height of the proposed dwelling if approved would as shown by the developers' proposal have a detrimental environmental impact due to the extent of overshadowing presented to all adjacent properties including our own.

The proposal does not take into consideration the extent of the overshadowing this development would have on our rear garden and outdoor living/entertaining area. According to Clause 4.1.3 Objective 3 developments should “allow adequate sunlight to private Open Spaces to adjacent residential developments.”

As shown on the overshadowing diagrams as submitted the majority of our back garden and outdoor living area would have much reduced sunlight which would result in the reduction of natural light and warmth during the winter season.

Also, the same Clause as above but Objective 2, states that proposals should minimise the disruption of Views to adjacent and nearby developments. Due to the proposed dwelling being over 30 square meters greater than allowed and the reduced side setbacks the existing views from the rear rooms of our house would disappear completely and we would no longer have the leafy outlook that we currently enjoy.

Finally, we have many concerns over the development to land ratio which is less than the required 55%.

The Council’s Land Referral Response as attached to the Development Application states in Clause 4.1.5 “Valuable Screening & Privacy” that the proposal under Objective 3 recommends that to maintain and enhance the Sunlight, Privacy & Views of the site, streetscape and **surrounding properties** that screening shrubbery to a minimum height of 3 metres and a tree canopy with a minimum height of 10 metres would need to be planted and maintained. However, due to the non-compliant open space proposed and the inclusion of a swimming pool sited along the west and rear fence line which also is non-compliant with a reduced setback from the rear property we are baffled by how the Council’s own recommendations could be applied especially as to include the proposed pool there must be a 900 (NCZ) Non-Climable zone surrounding the pool area!

We therefore, respectfully request that the Council NOT accept the proposed variations to the existing regulations in this particular instance and hope that the Council would advise to amendments being made to the DA as submitted.

Yours sincerely,

Rhonda Andrews & Colin Bruce
80 Macmillan Street,
Seaforth