
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 18/11/2022 5:22:52 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

18/11/2022

MS Karina Merriman
171 Plateau RD
Bilgola Plateau NSW 2107
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2022/1360 - 169 Plateau Road BILGOLA PLATEAU NSW 2107

I am writing in relation to the revised plans for the proposed development of 169 Plateau Road, Bilgola Plateau (DA2022/1360; Lot 5 DP 38402) lodged by I J May.

I'd like to acknowledge that with the applicant's amended plans there has been attempts to answer the concerns I included in my response to the initial proposed development plans and I appreciate the applicant's willingness to amend their development proposal in response to submissions from their neighbours.

NON-COMPLIANCE ISSUES

However, I still believe that there are concerns with the revised DA application that should result in the DA not be approved in its amended form as there is still areas of non-compliance, being:

Non-compliance issue 1 - Parking spaces

No additional parking spaces have been included in the revised plans. The reasons for concern in relation to this aspect stand as per my initial response.

Non-compliance issue 2 - Landscape area - environmentally sensitive land

Although the revised plans have amended the location of the entrance path to the secondary dwelling, it has not reached the 60/40% rule of C4 planning without the variation being included. As such this aspect stands as per my initial response.

Non-compliance issue 3 - Building and colour materials

As far as I can see the building and colour materials have not been amended in the revised plans and as such continue to be non-compliant with the Pittwater 21 DCP clause control.

SECONDARY DWELLING

In relation to the revised plans for the secondary dwelling, I continue to have the following concerns:

1. Location of the building along our northern property boundary. Despite the building location having been moved north on 169's property, the negative impacts of building the secondary dwelling on our northern property boundary have not been negated. If the amended plans were approved, we would still be significantly impacted in terms of our ability to enjoy our main living spaces, both indoor and outdoor, as well as our garden space in the manner that our building structure allows us to currently engage.
2. Even with the position adjustment of the secondary building, the visual disruption from the current natural, established vegetation outlook with only dappled, fleeting views of our neighbour's buildings, particularly in our seated and standing eyelines, to a new, high impact building throughout this visual zone would still occur.
3. Even with the position adjustment of the secondary building, we will still incur radical changes to the shadowing effects on our main living zones and northern side of our backyard, particularly in relation to morning sunshine which is a facet our building was designed to take advantage of many years prior to the proposal of this development. In fact, there doesn't seem to be any changes to the shadow analysis within the amended plans, so this situation has not been relieved in any sense by the amended plans.
4. Although the amended plans now have allocated planting zones along the boundary fence in 169, this has not been extended to the stormwater mitigation system which, according to the amended plans, continues to be visual to our property.
5. The orientation of the secondary building remains out of nature with the surrounding neighbourhood. By maintaining the original positioning the secondary dwelling will be perpendicular to all surrounding house, ensuring the largest possible impact on the property on the southern side of the building, which is mine. By taking advantage of the northern aspects for the secondary building, this building gains the best possible outcome for those occupants while creating the biggest possible impacts on our property in terms of the desired northern aspect.

There are other points in my initial submission in relation to the secondary dwelling that are still relevant as the submitted amended plans have not addressed nor relieved many concerns.

However, in this response I have decided to concentrate on the areas of the plans where amendments have been made to the plans in an attempt to address concerns that will still have significant impacts on our property.

CARPORT

There is now a note in the submitted amended plans about the carport being built to "future structural engineer's details", which does not provide any details on which to assess the design and building direction of this aspect of the DA. Without this information how are we to understand the impact of the proposed carport on our property. Since it is proposed to be located outside our main bedroom, this information is required to make any assessment on the impact of this structure.

As such, my initial response concerns still stand.

CONCLUSION

As such:

- I can NOT support the amended DA's proposal for a secondary dwelling in its submitted amended form, although I acknowledge that efforts are being made to final a suitable solution for the owners and their neighbours.
- I can NOT support the amended DA's non-compliance with the regards to the number of parking spaces on the property.
- I can NOT support the amended DA's proposal for the carport without further information.

I welcome further discussions and a site visit from Northern Beaches Council to my property to explore my concerns and what opportunities are available to allow Ian and Bessie May to develop their site without asking my property to bare the impact of the development.

Kind regards, Karina Merriman
171 Platea Road, Bilgola Plateau NSW 2107