

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 23 February 2023 5:31 PM
To: Erin Murphy
Subject: Submission related to DA/63169/2021/A
Attachments: 230223 Submission to Central Coast Council re DA no 63169 A.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Do not click any links or attachments unless you have checked the sender and trust the content is safe. If you are unsure, please report this to I&T Service Desk via the Portal.

Dear Erin,

Thanks for sending me your letter dated 31 January 2023 advising that Council has received a proposed amendment to DA/63169/2021 and asking if I wish to make a submission during a notification period which extended to 17 February 2023. The letter was sent to [REDACTED] which is an old address for sending notices. This address was changed over a year ago. Just eleven days earlier, on 20 January 2023, Council sent me a rate notice to the correct address at [REDACTED] which I received in a timely manner.

The DA letter was received at the old address, reposted, then received by me yesterday, 5 days after the Notification End Date. So it is impossible at this stage for me to comply with Council's notification schedule. I spoke with Gary earlier today from Central Coast Council and he suggested that I email a submission. Thanks for your email address. My response is attached to this email.

I have some serious concerns about changes to the development at No 386 and although it is now 6 days late, I request that Council consider my submission as if it was received within Council's time limits.

My submission is attached.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Submission to Central Coast Council re DA no 63169/2021/A

Increase in Floor Levels: It is understood that an increase in floor levels was required so that stormwater from adjoining properties did not drain into the development. The DA 63169/2021 Drawings show ground levels for the Northern elevation is level with the land on either side of No 386. The land falls generally from a high point near the road toward the beach along much of the length of the block on No 386 as does the land on both adjoining blocks, so the floor level for Units 1 and 2 become relatively higher than the existing ground level as the ground level slopes toward the beach. The existing highest ground levels on the boundaries on either side of No 386 are adjacent to Units 1 and 2. Those levels are within 20mm of the original proposed floor level of RL 2.60. So based on this information, there is really no justifiable reason for an increase of 300mm in the floor level for Units 1 and 2.

With regard to the floor levels for units 3 and 4, when Council's sewer system was installed for the area, the sewer pipe serving No 386 drains from the eastern boundary of No 386 to the east across DP 530357, and the sewer pipe serving No 392 drains from near the western boundary of No 392 to the west across No 398. This indicates that the boundary between No 392 and No 386 is a possible high point in the landscape.

The original DA drawings show that the ground floor level for Units 3 and 4 is below the existing ground level along the western side of Unit 4 and the amended DA drawings show that this situation has not really changed. The new ground floor level of RL 3.90 for unit 4 is still below the existing ground level at the boundary of No 392 and there is no obvious drainage benefit.

Having experienced heavy rainfall during holidays over many years at [REDACTED] what little runoff there is drains in a SSW direction toward the beach, not into No 386. On this basis, perhaps there is some other reason for an increase in floor level which has not been documented.

With regard to Units 5 and 6, ground levels shown on the original DA drawings indicate that the RL on the SE corner of No 386 is RL 2.16 and on the SW corner, is RL 1.55. The level of the boundary adjacent to the NE corner of Unit 5 is RL 2.16 and a spot level on the boundary approximately 3 metres north of the northern side of Unit 6 is at RL 2.40. As land slopes toward the beach, the existing boundary level adjacent to Unit 6 would be less than RL 2.4. This indicates that all existing corner levels of land adjacent to Units 5 and 6 are below the original floor level of RL 2.4. This means that the original floor level of 2.4 was suitable for adequate drainage and a 300 mm increase in floor level has not been justified.

The increase in floor levels of Units 2, 4 and 6 does, however, exacerbate our [REDACTED] providing clearer sightlines from the [REDACTED] at a higher angle into [REDACTED]

Privacy: I have previously commented on privacy concerns for [REDACTED] Booker Bay Road on the previous DA no 58314/2020 for No 386 Booker Bay Road by the same developer. These privacy matters remain for DA 63169/2021/A and an additional window in the western wall of Unit 4 is of concern. As I watch the construction of these units, I note that as spelled out in my earlier comments, there needs to be privacy screening on the [REDACTED] facing windows in Unit [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] facing balcony of Unit [REDACTED]. Sightlines from the [REDACTED] balcony of Unit [REDACTED] look directly through the southern window of the [REDACTED] at such an angle that the bed is in full view. Similarly, the [REDACTED] windows of Unit [REDACTED] look down and into the [REDACTED] window of the main [REDACTED] and into the [REDACTED]. Without appropriate privacy screening, [REDACTED] can only be used when all blinds are fully closed. While I am not against the development of No 386, it is unacceptable for the development to have such an extreme impact on the amenity of our house at [REDACTED]. I urge Council to ensure that appropriate privacy screening is installed by the developer.

Balustrade Finishes:

The [REDACTED] elevation shown on the original DA 36169/2021 drawings shows that the finish on the [REDACTED] face of the balustrade on Unit [REDACTED] is vertical timber. One can assume that this finish extends across to Unit [REDACTED] and that Units [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] would be similar. Also on the western elevations, the finish on the western side of the balustrades on all units is either Horizontal Timber (HT) or Vertical Timber (VT).

When I examine the elevations in DA amendment drawings 63169/021/A, the finishes on these balustrades are not clear. The balcony balustrades are now coloured as if they will be glass, however some indications of timber finishes remain. Changes to the balustrade finishes are not part of the DA amendment and it would be appreciated if Council ensures that the balustrades comply with the original DA 63169/2021 drawings. Any changes from timber to glass would further impact on our privacy. [REDACTED]