

Objection APP/24/00191

Further objections

APP/24/00191 34 Pennant Hills

Yet another unclear and poorly drawn plan. How many more revisions? This major redevelopment is not wanted by the majority of home owners in Pennant Hills and we continue to object to the current plan.

This planning application had previously been related to another application at no 34 but as that application has been withdrawn we can see no merit in the drastic change to the footprint of no 34, unless of course the applicant has been advised to get this application pushed through then try yet again on a further application for a new build in the garden of 34.

Builders tend to cram on as many houses as possible into a space, sell and move on regardless of the disruption, deterioration or detriment of other homeowners and our tranquil road. This bears weight as the garden is not being looked after has been turned into a builders yard full of building material and overgrown weeds.

However, at this time with only this one live application showing just one property at 34. To change the footprint of 34 [redacted text] will be out of character with the street. It will make it look excessively dominant, cramped and off centre. It's unnecessary.

Making a new wider dropped kerb does not increase the amount of space for car parking. We do not believe that there is sufficient space for a double garage [redacted text]. How accurate are the measurements on the plan?

Measurements - we have concerns about the accuracy of the measurements. The original house and grounds would have been built using imperial measurements yet amazingly all measurements now fit exactly into metric measurements. Have the plans been drawn to fit what the applicant wants to fit rather than actual measurements.

Having roughly measured the front boundary of where new double garage + 1 metre to boundary is suppose to be, it seems that the measurement falls short of what is shown on the plan.

As it is unlikely that the garage would be used for cars. Parking in this area on the road opposite driveways to numbers 5 and 6 will cause a further problem/nuisance.

There is no need to dig up a public footpath to make a new dropped kerb when there is already a driveway and garage at 34. In addition the digging up of the footpath at the existing driveway to raise the kerb would also not be needed. If the owner/family want more room any extension could go over the existing garage and would be more in keeping with the character of the road.

The homes were designed that driveways are not directly opposite each other making entering and engressing from the driveways easier. The proposed new driveway is directly opposite no 6 and can see this causing manouvering problems. Moving the existing driveway has no merit.

Our objections, based on the current revision are that it is unnecessary to drastically change the footprint of 34, no need to change the driveway entrance. By not changing the footprint this will not cause so much disruption, inconvenience, anxiety or stress to the lifestyles and wellbeing of all the other residents in the road. Better for us and the environment.

[Redacted text]