
Sent: 8/07/2020 3:24:15 PM
Subject: Attn: Adam Croft Re DA2020/0096 26 Ralston Rd Palm Beach
Attachments: Submission -Wallis.docx;

Hi Adam

Please find our submission in response to the amended plans for 26 Ralston Rd Palm Beach.

I would also like to arrange a time for you to come to our property to gain a better perspective of the objections we raise.

Thank you and regards

Danielle Wallis

8th July, 2020

Re: Updated DA Application for 26 Ralston Rd Palm Beach

Attn: Adam Croft

Dear Mr Croft

We have reviewed the amended DA application for the adjoining property, 26 Ralston Rd Palm Beach. Our concerns outlined in our original submission provided by Ingham Planning on the 16/3/20 remain unanswered in the amended plans. We also note that the detail, scale and complexity of the plans have made it incredibly difficult to interpret the true impacts upon our property and find that the absence of an open and transparent approach to the application process very concerning. This includes the failure to consult ourselves or other neighbours in the planning process.

As stated, all of our initial objections stand, please refer back to our original application for a comprehensive overview of each of the objections. The alterations outlined in the amended plans do not address our concerns and are tokenistic in nature.

Our key objections remain;

1. Visual and Aural Privacy.

The proposed Roof Terraces are at such a significant height above our property because of the slope of the land, that no amount of screening can reduce the visual and aural impact of them upon our property. Both Terraces will look into our open space and pool area which is an area that currently enjoys complete privacy. Additionally, we will have little control over future placements of structures, lighting etc which could impact us further in the future. The prospect of both these platforms (Lot 4 and Lot 5) being used as a space utilised by groups of people will undoubtedly give rise significant noise issues for both us and the neighbouring community which is not in the neighbourhood's interest and is contrary to the current environment in which we live. For these reasons we request that this part of the application be rejected completely.

The raised pool deck is adjacent to the outdoor open space that we use heavily. Being significantly higher than our open space, we will be impacted greatly by the noise and lack of privacy. The raised pool deck currently sits a metre higher than the top floor windows on the adjoining boundary allowing a perfect view into the bedrooms on the top floor of our property. The revised plan does not adequately address this issue. For this reason, we request that the pool deck be lowered or removed.

The height of the proposed development at the rear of our boundary means that visually we will look at an enormous and imposing structure. No amount of landscaping will be able to soften or reduce this given the sheer height of the

building. This will also impact our privacy in the outdoor open area at the rear of our property. Moreover, the shadowing of this on the rear of our property will be significant. This is not detailed in the included shadow diagrams. We take exception to the accuracy of these diagrams given that we have lived in the property for 10 years and are aware of the impact of the shadowing of the existing structure on our property which is nothing like what is detailed in the diagrams provided by the developer, this is despite the proposed development being significantly higher than the current one. For these reasons we request that council takes particular attention of the differences in the heights between the properties due to the lie of the land and rejects the height of the current application based on this.

2. Landscaping Design

We note in the below paragraph, taken from the Council's own response to the Landscape Plan, that the Landscape Plan does not meet council's requirements. We are very concerned that approval of this has been granted regardless of the issues raised in the paragraph below and particularly in relation to root mapping. This effectively places the decision-making responsibility regarding the roots of significant trees in the hands of a private certifier. We ask council to ensure that no approvals are given until root mapping has been carried out prior, in order to ascertain the potential impacts on the development and the consequential needs for further amendments to the structure. These trees are significant to the flora, fauna and aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood.

Additionally, we are concerned with the lack of detail and absence of significant thought and planning provided in the landscape plan. This provides us with little confidence that the plan will be implemented effectively and as such, the privacy and aesthetic influence that the landscaping is supposed to provide us, will not occur. We request that Council reviews the response to the landscape plan provided and request this be amended with the correct information and that root mapping of the significant trees likely to be impacted be conducted prior to approval.

The revised Landscape Plan, whilst providing an intent, does not satisfy Council's DA Lodgement requirements. A list of species, quantities and container pot size are provided, however the location of such species is not presented on the plans. Several locations include proposed trees in inappropriate areas that can't support large tree planting. It appears that large trees are represented graphically and listed along the rear and side boundaries occupied by the proposed buildings without sufficient space between boundaries and building to realistically allow for the establishment of such trees, including the Cheese Tree nominated on the landscape plan. Additionally, the landscape design and location of planting shall be considered to minimise significant impacts on neighbours in terms of blocking winter sunlight to either living rooms, private open space or solar collectors; or where the proposed location of the tree may be otherwise positioned to minimise any significant loss of views.

Summary

As previously stated, our original submission and objections remain as the amendments to the plan do little to address these concerns. We feel the approval of these plans would impact greatly on the privacy and quality of life we currently enjoy and would adversely impact the greater neighbourhood. We implore council to consider these impacts and reject this application or request further amendments which delete the roof terraces, the raised pool terrace, and address the landscape plan.

Additionally, I would like to request that council undertakes a site visit of the development site and the neighbouring properties to obtain a greater perspective of the issues at hand. I will call to make an appointment for this purpose in the coming days.

We appreciate your time and consideration in reviewing this submission and look forward to working with you to achieve a planning outcome that is acceptable to all those who stand to be impacted by this development.

Sincerely,

Danielle and Kevin Wallis