



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

The General Manager
Hornsby Shire Council

Dear Sir,

DA/734/2021 - 19 Chapman Avenue, BEECROFT NSW 2119 - RESIDENTIAL - SUBDIVISION - ONE LOT INTO TWO

The Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust objects to this proposed subdivision for the following reasons. In the Trust's opinion there are too many compromises that add up to a poor subdivision that in the long term, once a dwelling is constructed, will not be in the public interest.

There is insufficient information to accurately assess the DA. The proposed rear lot 192 does not identify a building footprint nor is there an indication where the car spaces or private open space can be located. More importantly, any building footprint or car space on lot 192 will, in all probability, necessitate the removal of additional trees, including an oak tree that has been described in the arborist report as having high value.

The likely loss of additional medium to high value vegetation on lot 192 when a dwelling is built must be assessed at this crucial subdivision stage. The additional loss of trees raises serious concerns as the backdrop behind the existing dwelling, currently with a screening of vegetation, will be removed and replaced by a 2 storey dwelling that will be visible from the street. This additional tree loss raises the important issue relating to streetscape and therefore the adverse impact on heritage.

The stormwater design should also include the likely discharge from a proposed development on the rear lot 192, as any development on lot 192 will be required to use the proposed drainage system.

The architectural and arborist plans indicate 9 replacement trees (one replaced for everyone lost) but the landscape plans indicate no replacement trees, only shrubs and grasses. The SEE provides a brief statement to this effect, but with no clear explanation why. The Trust must assume there is simply no available space on site to replant trees. As the loss of trees is likely to be greater than 9 once a dwelling is designed on lot 192 than the total tree loss is expected to increase by at least 50% and become significant and unacceptable. To quote Council's comments from the pre DA meeting: *Given the site is located within a heritage conservation area, all trees are protected and require consent for removal. Removal of a large number of trees would not be supported if their loss could not be offset on-site.*

The Trust has always argued against angular boundaries. They should be avoided as they create dead areas that can't be used and lead to poor amenity. Council's DCP reflects the Trust's position. To

quote Council's comments again from the pre DA meeting; *The HDCP encourages lot design that is compatible with the surrounding subdivision pattern. The obtuse angle of the splay is such that space either side of would likely be usable by both properties. It is therefore not considered a substantial issue in isolation.*

The angled common boundary is at an angle of 58 or 32 degrees to the rectangular (and historic) existing boundaries of the subject site. In fact all the existing lot boundaries in the street are either parallel or at right angles. 32 degrees is only 13 degrees off 45 degrees, being the worst angle possible. It would appear that the angled boundary is simply a means to achieve the minimum lot size but in so doing, it will create a myriad of future problems such as privacy and amenity, let alone being inconsistent with the historic subdivision pattern of rectangular boundaries.

The constraints of using an angular common boundary is further exacerbated by the fact that two proposed lots are of the minimum area. With minimum lot sizes every square metre becomes important with respect to privacy, amenity and construction. Because the lots are not flat but do have a noticeable degree of slope, then future privacy and amenity issues must be seriously considered at this crucial subdivision stage. Excavation on lot 192 for any proposed dwelling will be inevitably lead to further impacts on amenity and privacy but more importantly on the viability of the remaining trees on lot 192. There is a need to demonstrate that at this subdivision stage that these issues can be adequately addressed.

The issue of heritage has been raised in the SEE. As stated, a second driveway is not consistent with the objects of the heritage precinct, but considering the option of using the existing driveway for access to lot 192 has also the potential to create heritage and amenity issues. If the existing driveway is adopted for rear access then the positioning of car spaces and private open space for the existing dwelling facing the street becomes a significant issue.

In conclusion, the Trust does not support this proposed subdivision for the various reasons outlined above. The fact that the subdivision is in a heritage precinct the compromises described above are likely to lead to an unacceptable cumulative effect that, in the long term, will not be in the public interest.

Yours Sincerely,

Ross Walker OAM
Vice President
Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust

8 August 2021