



The General Manager  
Hornsby Shire Council

**DA/259/2020 - SECTION 8.2 REVIEW -181-183 Beecroft Road, CHELTENHAM  
NSW 2119 - COMMUNITY FACILITY - CHILD CARE CENTRE**

Dear Sir

The Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust continues to strongly object to the proposed development. The proposed amendments under sec 8.2 are considered minor, even superficial, and don't address the key issues that were the grounds for refusal by the Local Planning Panel. The Trust strongly believes heritage is still the overriding issue when combined with the bulk and scale of the overall development. Simply, the subject site is not the appropriate location for a child care centre of this size.

The Trust continues to object to the loss of physical and visual separation between the existing dwelling and the heritage listed former church if the child care centre is constructed. As pointed out in the Taylor Brammer report, the subject site has an extremely important and prominent position in the BCHCA. This is addressed in the Trust's earlier objections submitted in April 2020.

While the height of the new building has been lowered and the roof altered, the issue of scale and bulk still remain, including a significant increase in excavation for the basement parking. The size of the child care centre has not been reduced and still remains at 70 child places with its 18 car spaces.

The Trust considers the basement parking arrangement to be a poor design with a number of compromises. While the design may comply it is considered far from ideal. The Trust is concerned that with the manoeuvring bay for the basement located outside the actual basement and on the sloping driveway, this will create road safety issues. The 90 degree bend in the driveway creates turning and sight distance issues, especially coinciding with the change in grade that accesses the basement parking. Also parking on the sloping driveway entrance to the underground parking, including parking close to the 90 degrees entrance to the ramp, is considered not ideal. These design issues will discourage drivers (who are often in a hurry) to use the parking onsite, but instead to park in Cheltenham Road for convenience. This has the potential to create road safety issues of course, regardless of any signage. This car parking matter should be carefully reassessed.

The stormwater drainage should be further checked. This is a relatively flat site and gravity flow may be problem. The extensive use of pump out systems may be permissible, but the Trust prefers development sites where gravity flow is possible. This issue should be reassessed.

The Trust is concerned with change 12 on sheet DA07 where internal fittings such as doors that will be removed are to be set aside, protected and returned to client for their storage. This proposed condition instils little confidence that these items will be retained and protected in the longer term.

The Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) of the heritage listed garden by Taylor Brammer concentrates on the vegetation (naturally) and the assessment is not surprising, as gardens do evolve over time. But what the report tends to gloss over is the impact the proposed driveway will have on the original garden design and associated curtilage of the existing dwelling. In the report's introduction the author stresses the importance of positioning the existing dwelling within the unusually large grounds. Emphasis is also given to the property's prominent location at the intersection of Beecroft and Cheltenham Roads. This significance of the dwelling balanced between gardens is not fully addressed in the rest of the report.

While the vegetation in the northern side garden where the new driveway is proposed may have little significance, the actual garden with its soft green landscaping setting does create an essential balance for the existing dwelling in its overall setting. Regardless of the type of vegetation, the proposed driveway destroys the balance of garden beds on either side of the existing dwelling. This assessment is missing in the report.

The complete circular driveway is considered by the Trust to be important and again Taylor Brammer tends to avoid commenting on its truncation where the new driveway is proposed. The author comments on the separate footpath and gates but not the loss of the circular driveway. This is missing in the report.

The proposed outdoor play space on the front verandah of the existing dwelling with a safety gate and presumably a safety fence along the front of the verandah, is questionable. The Trust considers such a use as far from ideal and therefore unacceptable for such a prominent and visual part of the existing dwelling. Further, from a heritage position, the Trust does not support this play space.

In summary, the proposed changes do not address the important issues that formed the basis for the refusal on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2020 by the Local Planning Panel. The Trust highlighted many of these issues in its original objection and requests that Council refer to the Trust's earlier objections submitted in April 2020 in conjunction with this objection. This proposed development, with its amendments, is an overdevelopment of the site and is therefore still not in the public interest.

Yours sincerely,

Ross Walker OAM  
President  
Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust

5 January 2021