

## **24 Myola Road, Umina Beach**

### **DA application number DA/426/2024**

#### Development application objection

I am writing to you as a long-standing resident of [REDACTED] Road, a home my husband and I built over [REDACTED] years ago when we were newlyweds. Over the decades, our home has been the cornerstone of our lives, witnessing the growth of our family, our dedication to work, and our active participation in the community.

One of the most cherished aspects of living in our home is the proximity to the National Park and the abundant wildlife that graces our surroundings. Despite the occasional encounters with our slithering neighbours, we have always felt blessed to be part of such a vibrant ecosystem.

As we reflect on the memories spent in our home and the natural beauty that surrounds us, we cannot help but feel a deep sense of responsibility to preserve the legacy of our neighbourhood for future generations. Unfortunately, the proposed developments at 24 Myola Road pose a significant threat to this.

For [REDACTED] years, we have [REDACTED] the vacant block at 24 Myola Road, maintaining it and allowing children from Homan Close to access it on their way to and from school. We were initially excited to hear that the block had been sold and that someone would be building a home there, recognizing that change is inevitable.

However, our excitement turned to shock and heartbreak when we received the notification for the development application. The proposed two-story house not only clashes with the existing style of the neighbourhood but also threatens to disrupt [REDACTED] way of life.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] which has served as a gathering place for family and friends [REDACTED], would be entirely overshadowed. The loss of sunlight during the winter months would have a profound impact on our daily routines, as well as our ability to grow fruits and vegetables in our garden. I also believe our clothes wouldn't dry without any sun & that would mean the expense of a clothes dryer and extra energy expense which we've never had.

#### PUBLIC - Shadow Diagrams - PAN-421220 - 24 Myola Road UMINA BEACH - DA 426 2024

"The proposed dwelling is designed in such a way that allows solar access to habitable areas, recreational space and private open spaces on the site and on neighbouring sites. In addition, the proposal will not negatively impact on solar access to the adjoining dwelling due to distance from the adjoining dwelling and orientation. Please refer to the material and shadow diagrams attached to this DA for further details." (Statement of environmental effects)

- This is simply untrue
- The shadow diagram shows that we will have **no sun for winter** in [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] boundary which is where [REDACTED] outside, also blocking all the sunlight [REDACTED] area.
- Reading council guidelines, it states that we are required to receive 3 hours of unobstructed sunlight a day between 9am and 3pm. This will simply not happen with a two story house and the position planned.
- We currently get filtered light all day and had plans to have solar panels installed. These would be entirely pointless now.
- The house will become cold and dark and cause mould problems and could result in respiratory issues given our age.
- We would ask that the building either be set back further on the block to allow more morning sun, or that it be a single dwelling which uses more square meterage.

### STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

#### Visual privacy:

“The proposal will not have any adverse visual impacts as the dwelling has been designed to achieve great visual privacy in regards to adjoining dwellings. Direct views from the upper level of the dwelling are minimised to prevent overlooking to the common areas or private open space of any adjoining dwelling houses by and adopting translucent glazing up to 1.7m from floor level, as well as splayed / angled window locations in relation to adjoining dwellings windows and open spaces. Additionally, other architectural solutions will be in place to ensure visual privacy, and obscure glazing, privacy screening and other measures can be conditioned to the DA as considered appropriate. It is to be noted that the proposed side elevations of the proposed dwelling have been designed to match the bulk, scale and alternate sources of privacy concerns in regards to the side elevations of both adjoining dwelling houses.”

- [REDACTED] would be **entirely overlooked** [REDACTED] yard, there is one screen on a side window, but nothing seems to have been down about a window overlooking our yard to the rear. It is absolute an invasion of [REDACTED] privacy and contradicts the Central Coast DCP visual privacy.

#### Retaining Wall

- The Retaining walls are currently 200mm from the boundary- well within the DCP mandate of 1m.
- [REDACTED] Tree [REDACTED] and is within [REDACTED] of the boundary. The retaining wall is within the tree protection zone, and its root system has not been taken into account.

### Tree Protection Zone & Structural Root Zone

“The proposal includes the removal of vegetation to only where required to establish the building footprint and vehicular access. The subject site is not identified as being affected by the biodiversity values overlay but the proposal does involve the removal of some notable vegetation as is indicated in the Arborist Report. It is asserted that the proposal will not have a negative impact on the environmental values of the site. Additionally, compensatory landscaping will be provided on site which contributes to flora and fauna regrowth and facilitates the expansion and maintenance of the surrounding urban canopy. Please refer to the attached material for further details on the removal of trees”

- The current survey does not take into account the trees that are [REDACTED] property and on [REDACTED]. Please see attached drawing.
- There have been 3 surveys conducted so we request to see what the previous 2 surveys reported.
- No 26 has two trees, a Sydney apple gum and an angophora, again within 6m of the boundary. The proposed dwelling is within the tree protection zone and the angophora's root system is very visible on the surface.
- At the front of the dwelling there are several turpentine trees that are to be retained. The survey has not taken into account the root system of these trees. They currently extend across the entire block of 24 into No 22, and are very visible on the surface. In fact several years ago the roots of one turpentine uplifted the driveway pavers of No 22.
- We are extremely concerned about the safety and integrity of the trees that will be remain on site and on the neighbouring properties.
- The current proposal is to build on only **168m<sup>2</sup> of 929m<sup>2</sup>**. Trees labelled 14, 15A, 15B, 15C, 16, 17, 18, 19A, 19B & 19C are not in the vicinity of the proposed building but are to be removed, totalling a combined canopy spread of 98m<sup>2</sup>.

“This Assessment is valid for 3 months from the date stipulated on the report, and may require updates during and after this time period”

- This assessment was completed over a year ago and with plans for a different development.
- Their arborist's report claims: “No fauna habitat was recorded” This is blatantly untrue
- We question why these trees need to be removed. And if they are, then why is the building is not set further back on the block, or as stated earlier not a single dwelling that uses more square meterage.

As a long-standing resident of this neighbourhood, we have watched with anticipation as new families have moved in and the community has evolved over the years. We have met the new owners on more than one occasion and were excited about their plans and having the block developed. However, the recent proposal for development has left us profoundly disappointed and worried about the future of our neighbourhood.

The proposed building, as it stands, is vastly different from what we were led to expect. Instead of the suggested single-story home, the proposal presents a structure that is not only disproportionate in scale but also entirely out of character with the surrounding houses. Its design and style clash starkly with the cozy aesthetic that defines our neighbourhood, and I fear that its construction would irreparably alter the fabric of our community.

Moreover, the impact of such a development on our daily lives cannot be understated. The looming presence of this oversized structure would not only disrupt the visual harmony of our surroundings but also cast shadows over our homes and diminish our sense of privacy and tranquillity.

I implore you to consider the voices of the residents who call this neighbourhood home and to reassess the proposed development considering our concerns. It is our sincere hope that, through open dialogue and collaboration, we can find a solution that preserves the unique character of our neighbourhood while accommodating the needs of all stakeholders involved.

We are more than happy to meet onsite to discuss our concerns as a community, with council and the new owners.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to your response and to working together to ensure the continued well-being and vibrancy of our community.

Sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

Source extract:  
1. Public survey 22/08/2023  
2. Public Arborist report v2.5 22/05/2023

