



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

The General Manager
Hornsby Shire Council

Dear Sir,

DA/984/2022 - Subdivision of 11A Austral Avenue Beecroft

The Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust wishes to submit a second objection to the proposed two lot subdivision. Some local residents have recently approached the Trust raising additional concerns. These concerns are listed below.

Additional concerns regarding the existing driveway.

The adjoining resident at 15 Austral has a heated in ground pool that is frequently used by children in the street. Access to the pool and rear yard is through a side gate on the access way, hidden behind the brick chimney. This is considered a significant safety issue all year round and not just during the summer months.

The Trust understands that large vehicles, including construction trucks, will not be able to get past the chimney. This is an issue that needs addressing.

Also, exactly where is the boundary of the access way relative to the built chimney? The DP that defined the subject lot and the access way should have provided a diagram illustrating exactly where the chimney is relative to the boundary. A registered surveyor should be instructed to clarify this issue.

Heritage

The lot and proposed dwelling are positioned at right angles to the surrounding subdivision pattern. As the proposed dwelling is expected to dominate the landscape and be visible from the street, such an orientation will be inconsistent with the local heritage elements.

Privacy

The privacy of two existing dwellings at No 15 and 17 Austral Ave are expected to severely impacted by the proposed dwelling. No 15 and 17 Austral have limited scope to improve privacy in their rear yards. Factors that accentuate the loss of privacy include the natural slope of the land, the design of the proposed dwelling with windows and balconies overlooking to the south and existing fill on the proposed lot along the southern boundary.

No 17 Austral has attempted to create a vegetation privacy screen but due to the above mentioned factors any additional privacy measures will not be achievable in the future if this development proceeds.

Height of dwelling

The Trust notes that the proposed dwelling exceeds the maximum permissible height under the LEP. There appears to be no argument supporting this height variation. Also the height of the dwelling and its visibility from the street and neighbours is accentuated by the historic fill along the southern boundary. Further the amount of fill proposed along this southern boundary appears to greater than acceptable in the DCP.

It is also noted there is a mixture of tiles and metal sheeting on the roof in order to reduce the roof pitch. This is unusual and should be assessed against the heritage elements.

Dwelling setbacks

The relationship between the positioning of the proposed dwelling and the proposed driveway is considered highly undesirable. Building setbacks, including battleaxe lots, are designed to provide amenity and privacy. The proposed setback of the driveway of about 1 metre from the corner of the dwelling will not achieve those objectives.

Vegetation

There appears to be a row of significantly large shrubs located along the southern boundary that are absent from the arborist report. These large shrubs are well over 3 metres tall and currently provide excellent privacy for No 15 and 17 Austral Ave. These shrubs need to be addressed in the reports, in terms of not just plant health but also in terms of loss of privacy and amenity to all landowners.

The granny flat at No 9 Austral Ave.

The granny flat located in the rear of the lot hard up against the driveway cannot be ignored. It is highly likely it was not approved through a formal DA process so issues such as excessive cut and retaining walls should be checked for integrity of the access way.

In summary, as stated earlier, the Trust questions the merit of creating an additional lot when the access is so severely constrained by the adjoining dwelling. Creating an additional lot simply reinforces this poor policy that was adopted in the past, and thus creating further undesirable precedents. For this reason the subdivision proposed is not in the public interest

Yours faithfully,
Ross Walker
Vice President
Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust