

---

**Sent:** 28/08/2021 5:32:42 PM  
**Subject:** Submission regarding DA2021/1310

Dear Mr Burns,

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed secondary dwelling at 22 Rathowen Parade, Killarney Heights. We live in the adjacent property, 20 Rathowen Parade.

We understand our neighbour's desire to expand their home to accommodate additional family members and are not opposed to the construction of a secondary dwelling, however the current proposal does raise significant concerns and we do not believe the design is appropriate in its current form. We are happy to work with our neighbours and have spoken to them about our initial concerns.

The size, excessive height and bulk of the proposed dwelling will impact our property and will have consequences in terms of noise, solar access, privacy and visual impact. There also appear to be some inconsistencies in terms of the landscape ratio. We have outlined a few areas of concern below for your consideration.

### **Side boundary envelope**

The plans and accompanying environmental effects statement seeks a side boundary envelope exemption which we do not support. The proposed dwelling fails Part B3 Side Boundary Envelope of the WDCP 2011. We believe the height of the dwelling should be reduced to comply with the control.

### **Building bulk**

The design does not seem to take into account the topography of the site and we believe it would result in a building with excessive bulk. Given the location and height of the proposed secondary dwelling we believe that it fails Part D9 Building Bulk of the WDCP 2011. We believe that an appropriate remedy is to reduce the height of the proposed dwelling to a maximum height of 5.5m.

### **Loss of solar access**

Lack of shadow drawings means we are unable to assess the full impact of the proposed secondary dwelling on the loss of solar access compared to what we have today. We believe we would experience a loss of solar access on the eastern side of property due to the height of the proposed dwelling. This would result in a loss of natural light into our front courtyard and an existing second storey window due to the height of the proposed dwelling.

### **Impact on privacy and noise**

Given the location and height of the proposed secondary dwelling we believe it fails Part D8 Privacy of the WDCP 2011. Based on what we can interpret from the plans and the impact on privacy we request that the kitchen window on the western elevation to be obscured/frosted given it is a high usage part of the secondary dwelling. Additionally, given the height of the dwelling, the balcony would allow viewing into our property and we therefore request the maximum height of secondary dwelling be reduced to ensure compliance with the objectives

and requirements of this control.

It is unclear if the water storage tank will have a pump fitted which may result in noise, it would be helpful if this was clarified.

### **Landscaping**

The current boundary between the properties has an established screening hedge which also continues onto the rear boundary and obscures the view between properties. It would be great if the screening hedge could be maintained. A number of trees have already been removed from the property in preparation for the proposed construction with more to be removed which will further reduce the screening and privacy that already exists.

### **Landscape ratio**

The plans show a landscape ratio of 40%. There appears to be some areas of rock and paving included in the landscaped area, although we are not sure how these are normally treated in the calculations. From what we can see there does not appear to be any allowance for an entrance to the secondary dwelling from Rathowen Parade. If this is required in the future to allow the dwelling to be rented and have separate access to the front door we assume this would further reduce the landscaped area.

We do not believe the current proposal is fit for purpose given the concerns raised above. As mentioned previously we understand what our neighbours are trying to achieve and we hope that an alternate design will lessen the impact and provide a solution that achieves their desired outcome.

Kind regards,

Danielle and Igor Kwiatkowski