

Our property is almost opposite this property. In general we have no objection to the proposed development but there are a few items that we would like to lodge an objection to as set out below.

The DCP has a specific section that sets out the Local Specific Development Controls for Pearl Beach, namely section 5.10. It almost appears that the designer of the proposed structures was unaware of the provisions of this section.

1. Proposed Tree Removal on the Property

The development as proposed would require the removal of **ALL** trees on the property. In the introduction to Section 5.10 of the DCP it states “The distinctive asset of Pearl Beach is its natural environment.” and “The tree canopy is the intrinsic unifying feature of the area and it is **critical** that it be maintained.” (my emphasis) Most significantly, in 5.10.6 (b) (i) it states “Development on a site should be located so as to retain as many existing trees on the site as practicable.” This has clearly not been done.

The main aspect of the development that would be necessitating the removal of trees is the proposed undefined outbuilding at the rear of the property. I submit that this outbuilding should not be approved.

2. Proposed Removal of a Street Tree

The existing property has its driveway towards the southern side of the front boundary but the proposed development has its driveway towards the northern side of the property. Approval of this new driveway location would necessitate the removal of one of the two street trees at the front of this property. I submit that the driveway should be required to remain in its current location. This would require some redesign of the front of the dwelling but I suspect that this would not be difficult.

3. Proposed Front Setback

The front setback is proposed to be 4.0m but in Clause 5.10.9 (b) (i) it is required to be a minimum of 6.0m. I submit that the minimum in the DCP should be required.

4. Proposed Site Coverage

Section 5.10.7 (b) of the DCP requires the site coverage to not exceed 40% of the property’s area with a maximum of 300m². My calculations indicate that the area of the main structure plus the outbuilding is approximately 320m², which also represents approximately 42.5% of the property’s area. However, if the outbuilding were to be deleted these figures would not be exceeded.

5. Proposed External Materials

Clause 5.10.11 (b) (i) of the DCP states “External materials, colours and finishes of new development to complement the natural environment by a **limited use of masonry construction** and predominant use of materials sympathetic to the natural environment.”(my emphasis).

The front elevation of the proposed main residence incorporates some brickwork and some weatherboarding plus the garage door so it might satisfy the above clause. However, almost all of the other walls of the main residence and the outbuilding are “face brickwork” which clearly does not satisfy the above clause. I submit that the external cladding material should be changed to suit the above clause, for example, by the use of the weatherboarding to match the proposed front cladding.