
Sent: 21/02/2019 10:56:52 AM

Subject: FW: DA No: N0279/16/R 41 Marine Parade Avalon Beach Section 4.55 Application

Hi,

Please see email below

Thanks

From: Rebecca Englund <Rebecca.Englund@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>

Sent: Thursday, 21 February 2019 10:33 AM

To: DA Admin Mailbox - Northern Beaches <DA.Admin@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: FW: DA No: N0279/16/R 41 Marine Parade Avalon Beach Section 4.55 Application

Can someone please upload the attached email as a submission relating to Mod2018/0654.

Thanks,

Bec

Rebecca Englund

Acting Manager Development Assessments

Development Assessment Mona Vale

t 02 9970 1250 m 0417 241 040

rebecca.englund@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au



From: Matthew Edmonds <Matthew.Edmonds@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>

Sent: Monday, 21 January 2019 7:36 AM

To: Rebecca Englund <Rebecca.Englund@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>

Subject: FW: DA No: N0279/16/R 41 Marine Parade Avalon Beach Section 4.55 Application

Hi Bec,

Can you please consider this submission in the assessment of the current application,

Thanks.

Matthew Edmonds

Manager Development Assessments

Development Assessment Mona Vale

t 02 9970 1162 m 0417 021 314

matthew.edmonds@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au



From: Bill McCausland <bymccausland@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, 18 January 2019 4:00 PM
To: Matthew Edmonds <Matthew.Edmonds@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: Michael Hesse <hessemichael30@gmail.com>
Subject: DA No: N0279/16/R 41 Marine Parade Avalon Beach Section 4.55 Application

The General Manager
Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 882
MONA VALE NSW 2103

Attention: Mattew Edmonds & Ms Rebecca Englund

DA No: N0279/16/R 41 Marine Parade Avalon Beach
Section 4.55 Application

Dear Sirs,

We are the owners of 37 Marine Parade Avalon Beach neighbouring the Applicants property at 41 Marine Parade.

We implore Council in the strongest terms to uphold the decisions of the Panel and reject any attempt to try to overturn them. Council must insist the applicant demolishes any work that does not accord with the construction certificate.

What is of great concern to us, and certainly should be for Council, and members of the Panel, is the blatant refusal by the applicant to respect the Panel's and Council's conditions of consent.

Part of those conditions directly affecting us, was the erection of a specifically built and positioned privacy blade as a permanent fixture and was clearly spelt out in the following terms as cut and pasted below.....

- **The architectural hood over the western window of that dining room is to be turned down as a vertical blade adjoining and to the full extent of the northern end of that window. That blade is to be no less than 250mm in depth. This is in order to provide additional privacy for neighboring properties at 37 and 39 Marine Parade**

The panel placed that condition after lengthy consideration and submissions as mitigation for our loss of privacy the applicants imposed upon us via their imposing design. It was much less than what we would have liked but accepted the panels decision as a compromise. It would appear the applicant holds no such respect for the Panel's decision, evidenced by their actions to date, ignoring all protocol and just doing what they want.

In his error ridden Environmental Report, Mr Fish tries to argue the Privacy Blade is no longer relevant or needed in an attempt to make light of it's legitimacy. His argument is flawed in its claims and the self serving images that attempt to alter perspectives. His attempt to denote the changes as minor

is ridiculous and he can't even get basic facts of property descriptions and house numbers correct. True to his previous reports, he makes false and misleading assertions and is disrespectful to all involved in the lengthy process and debate that established the need for the blade to be conditional.

His submission makes a mockery of the Panels efforts to establish a fair compromise and therefore should be rejected in the strongest terms.

Many other aspects of the S4.55 Application are also flawed including but not limited to Costing falsified, Basix Report incomplete and differing from actual built structure, Fire reports not acknowledging the major design changes particularly in now placing bins, a doorway and metering directly in the Flame Zone, the plans not dimensioned etc. We would be happy to meet with Council officers to show them all the flaws in the application that should affect their recommendations.

We respectfully request Council reject outright, the application in its present form as it is so compromised by a mixture of both false information lack of critical information as to render it impossible for Council officers and residents wishing to make submissions, to properly assess the overall impact of the massive changes that are being being disguised as "minor" by their flawed documentation.

We have read and support the concerns and issues raised by the Hesse's in their submissions. A truthful and properly detailed application should be a minimum requirement all applications. This is not the case with the original DA or current application for a Section 4.55 by the applicant. The fact that the applicant has gone ahead and carried out major construction work ignoring the clearly spelt out conditions of consent is, we believe ample grounds to force the applicant to demolish any non approved work. The applicants attempt to reverse the panels previous decisions by making false and misleading submissions, must be rejected.

Yours Faithfully
Yvonne & Bill Mccausland