

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, 22 June 2020 2:05 PM
To: Ask
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objection to DA 5834/2020 at 2 c Amethyst Street, Pearl Beach

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To council,

I oppose the proposed plans for DA5834/2020 for the following reasons:

1. Overdevelopment of a very small site

The scale and proposed DA changes are a massive overdevelopment of an already very small site and should be rejected immediately. The development:

- it fails to comply with the local Pearl Beach DCP, and it's
- its bulk and setbacks within its context is excessive for the size of the site, its relationship with adjoining development and out of keeping with the low density nature of the precinct of Pearl Beach.

2. The loss of the Norfolk Pine is unjustified on a number of reasons - it is on the boundary of the Adjoining site (19 Diamond Rd) and hence the applicant has no right to remove it without consent. The tree is an important landmark item and provides visual amenity, shade and privacy between properties. It makes an important contribution to the street scape and general character of the beach front.

4. The change to off- street parking is unjustified and especially as it unnecessarily and unreasonably comprises the health of the tree.

5. I am unclear the legal status of the subject site. However, a site of that scale would never been approved now or under proposed changes to the LEP that propose to lower minimum lot size. There is not justification to approve a house of such scale on an exceptional small site. Not only does this contravene the planning principles that support the local planning controls it would, if approved, lead to a swag of further proposals to subdivide and build on unreasonably small sites. The existing development appears to be a small conversion of a garage, that as later severed from the main block that may or may not have been legally approved. This history is problematic and should not be supported as a valid example of increasing density.

The site should support at most the scale of a granny flat and no more. The applicant has already benefited from a very small lot supporting a single dwelling, well under planning controls, in easy walk to the beach. There should be no further leniency given to the applicant where historical contravention of the planning controls has been so excessive and unfair to other residents, who are required to comply.

There is no reason to make worse to the already poor planning decisions of the previous councils or certifiers.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

>
>
> Sent from my iPad