

To the Review Panel of Re DA 0145/19

Firstly I would like to thank the panel for the opportunity to speak and making the effort to come to our property for a site inspection. We should also state we recognise that Mark and Gina want to develop their property. We ask that they take into account our position.

After reading the Development Application Assessment report we are concerned by its findings with respect to the development application.

Our concerns still remain:

- View loss/Amenity
- Floor Space Ratio
- Set backs

Setbacks

The report states that the application complies with that on existing streetscape of Adelaide St. We suggest that it is not the street that should be considered but the unique location of the property in context to ours. The applicant and the assessor have used the driveway to compensate for this. The driveway is our property and our land and should not be used to provide compensation for set back.

Floor Space Ratio

The development proposes a floor space ratio of **58.47%**. On page **15** of the DAA report it provides a summary of recent developments. This FSR is significantly more than any other property in recent years and the highest previously No. 35 Adelaide Street - **38.9%** in 2017. Which is on the east side of our property! Therefore, allowing 2 property on both sides to override the standard in floor space ratio.

It seems that as far as we are concerned FSR does not seem to make any difference to the planning application and people can develop as they want. If the council approves this what is to stop others in the neighbourhood doing exactly the same as Mark and Gina and stating this as a precedent. Of course this is especially concerning with respect to the adjoining property of Michael and Christina Bell that is directly in front of our house.

View Loss

We currently have a 180 degree view from our top floor that is uninterrupted. It is my understanding that there is a view sharing policy. Mark and Gina have today an uninterrupted view west of their property as do we. Yet with their proposed addition of a top floor our view is significantly impacted and theirs is further enhanced by the addition of a 3rd floor. Not much in the way of sharing there. Yes, we recognise they have made a small adjustment to the top floor to provide a minimal view enhancement but in no way does this provide any compensation for the impact and loss of amenity of our property.

We propose that the new floor proposal as it stands today will absolutely impact our house from an economic factor in terms of loss of value due to the loss of view. However, the application assessment disregards this.

From the proposed position of the site poles it is clear that our living, kitchen areas are affected by the application even as we come up the stairs we are confronted it. At every aspect of our top floor we will see a wall that was once a sky line and district views.

In conclusion

The report makes reference to precedent as a justification for allowing the application to continue. But, this application is unprecedented in this street with a significant impact on our property. And, any new development application in the street or neighbourhood will absolutely use this as a justification for their non complying development.

We ask the committee to review the application in terms of

- Review the **set backs** as they in reality next to our property.
- **Floor Space Ratio** and it is extreme nature of 58.478%. The top floor addition adds 3 extra bedrooms to the property of a significant size making a total of 5. Which is the major reason for the non complying floor space ratio. We suggest making the top floor smaller.
- **View Loss** significantly impact us and to minimise this loss we suggest a movement of the top floor addition at least 3m north to reduce the obstruction of our top floor, and in addition review the peak and the ceiling heights of the top floor and reduce them.