



**BEECROFT
CHELTENHAM**
CIVIC TRUST INC
the voice of our community

The General Manager
Hornsby Shire Council

Dear Sir

DA 1257/2016 AMENDED PLANS - RESIDENTIAL - SENIORS LIVING - SENIORS HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 8 INDEPENDENT LIVING UNITS

The Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust objects to the amended development. While the amended plans address many of the earlier concerns the Trust had with the original design and we further acknowledge that there is a demand for senior housing in the area, this proposed development must be more sympathetic with respect to the objectives of the LEP and also the SEPP, including the elements of the heritage precinct and the interest of the public.

The Trust's objection centres around the bulk of the rear complex together with its minimal setbacks from the side and rear boundaries and its separation from the two retained houses in front. Combine these minimal setbacks with the excessive height and the net result is a rear building complex that dominates all the rear yards in the immediate area. It is out of character in this specific area of the suburb for the following reasons. An aerial photograph of this area of Beecroft clearly shows an expanse of private open space surrounding these stately contributory homes. In particular the deep rear yards of the vast majority of these houses are large and provide a significant curtilage that extends completely around the houses and links up with the large front yards thereby providing a balanced and complete curtilage. This characteristic of large rear yards in this heritage precinct is very important in this original section of Malton Rd.

The Trust does not support the detailed argument presented by the applicant justifying the variation in both the LEP and the SEPP development standard. It is not in the public interest to construct a building that dominates the surrounding properties with its extra height and minimum setbacks in combination. The rear building would blend in more and even function better if it did comply with the development standards and not be such a squeezed-in unsympathetic development.

To quote from the SEE,

Consideration of the compatibility of the proposal and its surroundings can be undertaken with regard to the Land Environment Court Planning Principle on "compatibility with context" in Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council [2005] NSWLEC 191. In order to test whether a proposal is compatible with its context, the following two questions can be asked:

- *Are the proposal's physical impacts on surrounding development acceptable? The physical impacts include constraints on the development potential of surrounding sites.*

The Trust strongly believes the rear building complex will create unacceptable physical impacts on surrounding development and it will place constraints on the development potential of surrounding sites. Therefore a smaller rear building would be better overall.

The Trust also supports Council's view that the existing footpaths in Wongala Crescent do not comply with the access requirements under the SEPP and therefore we support any condition that requires the footpaths to be reconstructed in order to comply with every clause of the SEPP.

Yours sincerely

Ross Walker
President
Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust

2 August 2017