

## Submission to the Development Determination Panel

Re: DA2021 /0129, 107 Frenchs Forest Road, Seaforth 2092

To The Panel Members,

My objections to this development stand as stated in my submissions of March 2021; specifically loss of privacy, loss of view, increased shade areas and lack of screening vegetation along the rear boundary.

The proposed dwelling is oversized for such a small block and its “severe” impacts to 78 Macmillan St. are noted in the Assessment Report of 2 August.

It is not my intention to prevent development of the property but to highlight the excessive density and bulk, particularly the height of the roof pitch, of the proposed dwelling. This is a spec home designed to sit on an appropriately sized block, not one of reduced size as 107 Frenchs Forest Road occupies.

Specifically, I note in the Assessment Report that, *“The view loss has been assessed above as being up to the ‘severe’ range.* This was assessed from the ground floor living areas where most of my, or any other individual’s, time is spent. The comment in this section also makes note of “view corridors” from the upper level windows, which are bedrooms. As the designation of the room implies, they are rooms for “beds”, not living, and I would argue that very few residents spend much time in an upstairs bedroom to compensate for a severe loss of view in their living areas. I therefore disagree that this loss of view is considered “reasonable”; it is not.

This loss of view is caused by the density and bulk and excessive roof pitch of the proposed dwelling. I note the roof pitch of 8.5m, based on a 500 sq mtr, is satisfied. I would argue that this roof pitch on a smaller block of 362 sq mtr produces an adverse impact, as stated, and that a reduced roof height/ scaling for small blocks needs to be addressed.

Seaforth is a low density, exclusive suburb. This dwelling, in my opinion, is a high density structure requiring multiple exemptions to fit this oversized spec home on a block of insufficient area. Surely there must be another spec home design available that will satisfy Council’s established guidelines and restrictions. Why should it be allowed? What is the housing emergency in this area requiring these variations to be granted to allow this particular structure to be built? This dwelling, in size and bulk, is unreasonable.

We live in a new world of covid and community lockdowns. Residents are required to remain at home unless absolutely necessary. Our homes are now, more than ever, sanctuaries of security and comfort. Unfortunately, I suffer from Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD) as a result of an aircraft accident in October, 2008. I was the Captain of Qantas Flight “QF72”, which caused extensive and severe injuries to 119 of my passengers and crew. A MAYDAY emergency landing was declared and

we were able to land safely, however the psychological damage caused by that event continue to affect my life, and those of everyone on board. This proposed development will be a constant source of frustration and insecurity for years to come if it is approved in its current form.

I am a reasonable man, despite the lack of consultation from the Applicants towards their neighbours prior to submitting this development application. In its current form, it is a development that will adversely affect the residents of the adjoining homes.

As such;

If this Panel deems the development to be reasonable, I would ask, as a compromise, that the dwelling be moved further forward towards French Forest Road. As stated in the Developer's amended claim:

*"The rear setback could be increased if the Council reduced the front setback. It is noted that the DCP control for front setbacks requires dwellings to respect the existing setbacks. It would be noted from Figure 2 below that there is no consistent front setback, however, the proposed dwelling has observed a setback that is consistent with the DCP. "*

This is a compromise I would accept, and it appears that it is possible. With that setback, I would also ask the 'alfresco' area to likewise be shifted forward, away from the rear boundary. Additionally, the rear boundary fencing height could be increased, at the Applicant's expense, to provide an improvement to the loss of privacy that has been identified.

Finally, I would ask Council to review their design guidelines to address the increasing number of blocks under 500sq mtrs, ensuring appropriate and reasonably sized structures are built without the need for extensive exemptions, thus reducing adverse impacts on surrounding homes in this exclusive suburb.

I thank you for your time and consideration in reviewing my submission.

Regards,

Kevin Sullivan  
78 Macmillan Street  
Seaforth 2092