
Sent: 6/05/2024 8:29:25 PM
Subject: DA2024/0081 - For the attention of Jordan Howard

Sir/Madam

I am the owner and occupier of 7 Malbara Crescent, Frenchs Forest and have recently received notice of application DA2024/0492 "Notice of Proposed Development" ("**DA0492**") in connection with 49 Blackbutts Road.

Having reviewed DA0492 I am now aware of the scale of proposed tree removal at this site which is of surprise and concern both to me and my neighbours.

Of still deeper concern is the inclusion of the tree removal proposal in previous DA2024/0081 ("**DA0081**") which was described innocuously as "Demolition - Demolition of all existing structures on site" The obvious inference being that the scope of 0081 was limited to the inevitable and non-contentious removal of the aging and decommissioned building structures. I wish to register strong objection to both DA0081 and DA0492 in relation to:

1. Community engagement
 - a. The description of DA0081 "Demolition of existing structures" was grossly misleading and opportunistic given the scale and permanent environmental impact of tree removal. The general community does not consider trees to be structures.
 - b. Therefore it is unreasonable to assume that the community has studied the DA0081 supporting documents in detail given alignment of nomenclature contained in formal notification to the well socialised and generally accepted notion that the aging and obsolete buildings would be demolished following sale of the site to developers.
 - c. I have spoken to neighbours who are similarly concerned about the proposed tree removal and equally concerned that the DA0081 submission period has ended
 - d. I note that the NBC confirms that all objections will be considered prior to decision date, irrespective of formal consultation timeframes.
 - e. On this basis I set out below my substantive concerns about the proposals
2. Environmental impact
 - a. The scale of removal of native species that has matured over in excess of 50 years at this site is without local precedence, to my knowledge
 - b. The trees at this site are integral to the character and identity of the local precinct which would be significantly diminished in event of their removal
 - c. The site occupies a high elevation in the precinct more generally and many of the larger trees are visible on the skyline from Frenchs Forest and adjoining suburbs. Loss of visual amenity would be experienced by a significantly larger number of people that have been captured by direct consultation.
 - d. There is a rich abundance of native wildlife that occupy the site and the scale of tree removal would constitute a material and unsympathetic reduction of this habitat
 - e. The community in the immediate vicinity of the site has received informal engagement in relation to site decommissioning and sale diligently facilitated by the sites previous owners that has included references to the environmentally sustainable nature of proposed development in new ownership including specific reference to the intent of Shawood/Sekisui to preserve existing trees.
 - f. The Shawood/Sekisui documents under the more recent DA0492 are inconsistent with these principles. DA0492 reveals plans that have evidently been carefully optimised for building density. The proposed building footprint evident in DA0492 reveals uniformly organised plots and building footprint density that can only be achieved by the extensive use of cut and fill earthworks and large scale tree removal that is proposed. There is no evidence of tree preservation efforts in these plans.

In summary myself and the community are justifiably concerned about the environmental impact of tree removal and I am gravely concerned about its "below radar" inclusion in a previous demolition

application. The more detailed proposed site plans available under the subsequent DA0492 provide material context to consideration of the tree removal proposal not least in the conspicuous absence of any serious attempt by the developer to mitigate this environmental loss.

I trust that you will give my concerns due consideration
Robert Scott