

The General Manager Hornsby Shire Council

Dear Sir,

DA/215/2020 - 65C & 67 Malton Road, BEECROFT NSW 2119 - SUBDIVISION

The Trust has no choice but to strongly object to the proposed subdivision as submitted. The reasons are provided below.

Material submitted

Many of the submitted documents have minor errors, and inconsistencies. This makes commenting difficult and annoying. For example the SEE refers to a turning bay on the proposed lot 1 but the subdivision plan appears to omit it. A turning bay is shown in the arborist's report, but unfortunately the turning bay is not shown in the engineering plans. Also lot boundaries and areas vary between plans. The Trust is unable to submit accurate comments when we have no confidence in the accuracy of the plans.

We recommend that Council reject these plans as submitted and request the applicant to provide more accurate information. A new exhibition period is also requested after more accurate plans are submitted.

Other comments

Proposed Lot 1

The creation of the new lot 1 is considered to be a serious concern. Lot 1 has a 'tear drop' shape that severely limits redevelopment, privacy, amenity and noise alleviation. Any development on this extremely poorly shaped lot would struggle to comply with Council's planning controls. The existing dwelling does not comply with Council's current planning controls as it is positioned with a minimal setback on the existing lot 1 DP25800. The Trust considers the existing dwelling as being an intrusive item in the heritage precinct but, also due to its poor amenity, it is likely to have a limited life. By approving the subdivision however, Council is condoning the existing intrusive development and any complying redevelopment option will effectively be removed. This is considered to be poor planning practice.

The engineering plans

The engineering plans do not appear to show the proposed turning bay on Lot 1. This omission is considered important because of its position opposite the driveway entrance to the proposed lot 2. It is at this location that the driveway also enters a 6 metre curve with a continuous 25% grade.

The Trust is concerned with the proposed stormwater outlet. Stormwater is likely to be discharging out of the pipe onto Council's reserve at a high velocity, causing long term scouring and weed growth. This needs further consideration.

Other reports

Many of the other reports refer to, and assess, only one lot. They ignore the second lot that is part of the subdivision. Regardless of the degree of impact, the Trust understands that both lots should be addressed in the reports.

Bush fire requirements.

The bushfire report that tends to ignore No 65c Malton Rd. even though it is part of the subdivision. While there is a dwelling on 65c, the Trust would expect an APZ would still be required over this property and involving the adjoining built properties. The report refers to these built properties as being 'self managed' for an APZ, when they clearly are not. This matter needs clarification.

Owners' consent

This proposed development involves a number of properties, involving the creation, extinguishment and alteration of easements. Council is requested to ensure that all affected owners have provided the necessary consents to this development proposal.

In conclusion, based on the material provided, the Trust does not support the proposed subdivision, specifically the creation of a third lot described as lot 1 in the plan of subdivision. Lot 1 is considered to be of inferior quality that clearly conflicts with the key elements of the heritage precinct. The Trust considers the subdivision to not be in the public interest.

Yours sincerely

Ross Walker OAM President Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust 27 March 2020