



The General Manager  
Hornsby Shire Council

Dear Sir,

**DA 1277/2017 being Seniors Housing at 95-97 Copeland Rd and 14 Hull Rd Beecroft**

The Trust has serious concerns with the amended plans.

**Access to public transport**

The Trust notes that the footpaths in Hull Rd and Hannah St have been redesigned to just comply with the SEPP requirements. However the 30 degree embankment from the footpath to the actual west bound bus stop appears to still be un-resolved. This needs to be addressed.

**Heritage considerations**

The applicant should provide a fresh heritage report for the house at 97 Copeland Rd and not rely on the assessment and conclusion reached in the previous DA approval for subdivision. For example, there may be an opportunity to retain the 97 Copeland Rd house, which definitely has heritage value, and incorporate it into the new development. This must be explored with this new DA. We are led to understand from the earlier heritage assessment that the Copeland Rd house is substantially altered and set too far back from the street to be worthy of retention. However, we know from the earlier heritage report that its heritage significance is very closely tied to the adjoining house at 99 Copeland Rd which is also set back on its site. Both houses have a close connection and were built with a large setback for a reason, namely streetscape, which is a key element in the heritage precinct. None of this was fully addressed in the earlier heritage report that accompanied the first DA for subdivision. Also not addressed is the strong likelihood that if the demolition of 97 is approved then a precedent will be created for 99 Copeland Rd to eventually be demolished as well, regardless of its potential significance and both in a heritage precinct. The retention of the old house at 14 Hull is supported, as it will contribute significantly to the heritage streetscape.

**Uncharacteristic development under the Seniors Housing SEPP**

The Trust is still of the view that seniors housing, with the bulk and density proposed in the design, is not in character with the surrounding low density detached housing where dual occupancy and multiple dwellings are prohibited. The character of the area is a key element that the Department of Planning has stressed many times must be considered under the SEPP. If the seniors housing was of a lesser design, with less bulk, height, scale and separation, and reflecting the surrounding detached

housing in a heritage precinct; then it may be acceptable. The Trust is therefore arguing that the applicant is seeking to optimise the development to the detriment of the objectives of the zoning, resulting in an uncharacteristic development in the heritage precinct. Also using approved seniors housing elsewhere in the suburb should not be used as an accepted precedent, but instead they should be used as an example of inappropriate development.

The Trust still supports refusal of the current design.

Yours Sincerely  
Ross Walker  
Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust

6 April 2018