



19 October 2021

The General Manager
Northern Beaches Council
725 Pittwater Road
Dee Why 2099

Attention David Auster Planner

**SUBMISSION IN RESPONSE TO DA2021/1755 FOR PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND
ADDITIONS AT
152 HEADLAND ROAD NORTH CURL CURL**

My wife Lenette and I own and reside at 154 Headland Road, being immediate neighbours to the west of the subject property.

I have viewed the documents and generally support the submission with the exception of the proposed new roof which adversely effects our amenity in terms of view loss.

Our main living area is to the top level and we enjoy views over the ocean from the Dee Why headland to North Head. The new roof as proposed effectively eliminates our view of the interface of North Curl Curl beach and the ocean. Due to the topography and established vegetation of the shoreline this is the only area of sand that is visible from our property, so is of particular importance to us.

The submission acknowledges that the new roof exceeds the 8.5m height limit, however the east and west elevations incorrectly represent the natural ground levels and offset these hypothetical levels to represent the height line. The residence was built in the late 50s so these levels have been in place for over 60 years. It is also evident from the rockface that negligible excavation, if any was carried out when the house was built.

The building envelopes are not represented on the elevations. The roof setback to the east is 724mm and to the west is around 100mm so clearly the roof on both sides will exceed the building envelope control.

We have no objection to a roof over the additional floor space proposed to the first floor as long as the ridge is no higher than 100mm above the existing concrete beam that runs east west and is integral with the concrete slab roof. The new roof is shown with a 5 degree pitch. Metal roofs such as 'Klip-Lok 406' with a thickness of

P.2. Cont-

0.48mm has a recommended pitch of 1 degree or 1 in 50. which would be more appropriate. Similarly, we do not object to the roof area over the eastern end of the terrace with the projection reduced to 3.5m from the external wall housing D6 and extending no wider than D6 to the west. In other words, no roof extension to the western half of the existing roof and with the new roof section at the same level or lower than the existing. This will still be detrimental to our view but if controlled as suggested will be acceptable.

The shadow diagrams from my reading do not show the difference from the existing and that as proposed. Due to the non-compliance of the height and building envelope controls any loss of solar amenity due to the new roofing would seem unfair.

The 4.6 variation request in my view is flawed.

Clause 4.3. Height of Buildings part

- 1(a) states *'To ensure that buildings are compatible with the height & scale of surrounding and nearby development'*. Our property and that proposed for 150 Headland Road (DA currently with Council) are stepped into the topography. The owners of 152 inherited a 3 storey house with each level sitting on top of the other and having minimal side setbacks which produces a bulky form that is not compatible with the scale of surrounding development. The addition of the roof exasperates this situation.
- 1(b) states *'To minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy & loss of solar access'*. As argued the proposed does not meet these objectives.

Yours faithfully,



Gerald Gilchrist