
Sent: 2/03/2021 2:44:53 PM
Subject: Application No. DA2020/0511

Apologies, can you please delete my previous email as I sent from work which included my signature which it should not have. Could you please email me back to let me know you were able to do this. Thank you!!

DA: 2020/0511

Address: 87 Iris Street Beacon Hill & 89 Iris Street Beacon Hill

Dear Livia

Unfortunately I am not able to make tomorrow however I would like my concerns noted for the meeting tomorrow.

In review of the reports provided, it seems that the application has been scheduled for this meeting due to the number of objections received and not so much due to concerns on compliance of the development.

Obviously many of the residents do not want this development in the area as per our concerns previously raised in the application process. I understand a few of our concerns raised do not raise concern with Council as the design is as per SEPP guidelines. On our points previously raised, we as residents struggle with the practicality of applying one rule of compliance across the board for our area as all environments are very different. For example:

TRAFFIC

The traffic consultant may state minor effect to the current traffic flow in Iris Street but as all the residents have stated, the road is quite busy now and at times dangerous with parked and moving cars. The road is thought to be already busy to Council as they have previously monitored the traffic on a daily basis. We have previously requested the road to be closed off near Oxford Falls Road as Tristram Road was to help with the busy traffic flow and restrict to residents only. Surrounding road closures and current road upgrades are pushing cars to Iris Street as a short cut to Oxford Falls, Frenchs Forest Road and Wakehurst Parkway. This is also creates a safety concern for the public including the children who use this street not only for leisure but to walk to school.

I know reports have been submitted however as residents of the area including our neighbours who have lived in the street for 40 years, perhaps Council should take the time to listen to our experience in this matter.

PARKING

Parking is a substantial issue around this development. As it has been previously stated, off street parking is limited due to no parking zones to allow for bus arrival and departure at the bus stops. Additional cars in a small area will create the need to "fight" for a car parking space.

Guidelines state the parking ratio to be 0.5 per room however it is a known fact that the residents of Seniors Living are mostly of good health with more of the desire to downsize and therefore generally have a car each. At a minimum of 2 cars per unit, visitors and consultants attending appointments, the number of spaces provided on site is not enough as there is a minimum of 15 spaces required before visitors (conservative average of 1.5 cars per unit). This does not include the potential of a couple owning a caravan for travelling purposes throughout the year. The build is close vicinity to the bus stop and is required as a condition however how many residents catch the bus and/or drive.

As we know, the average age of life expectancy is increasing as is average age of good health for seniors. This needs to be considered in this application.

PRIVACY

We reside at no. 93 and have great concerns regarding the minimal privacy measurements for it seems that 5 out of the 10 units will look over to our property. From the blocks of the proposed development, the units located towards the rear of the block will be able to see into both 91 & 93 due to the elevations and location of balcony's. I understand trees have been included in the design however they would not be of the size or location to create full privacy from the residents of the Seniors Living spaces. If the trees are of the size to provide such privacy, I question the shadowing it will create for the adjoining blocks. In a normal residential environment over two blocks you would not have this many balcony's or residents in the one space and therefore these privacy issues need to be addressed and amended as required to achieve deserved privacy for all neighbours of an adjoining property. Our privacy should not be jeopardised for a development such as this.

CONSTRUCTION PERIOD

I read in the reports that the neighbouring properties will have dilapidation reports prior to commencement of works. Depending on the degree of excavation, should this condition be extended to our site? I don't know hence more of a question. As it is a large company, can the contractors work 6 days per week full days or is a more reasonable timeframe provided considering this size of the project?

GENERAL

With the number of Boarding Houses increasing in our area and large Seniors Living Development on Skyline Place Frenchs Forest, we don't believe Iris Street is the suitable location for any such development. As we are seeing from the real estate market, there is a high demand for residential housing which I believe these areas to be more suited for our environment. The commercial build types should remain focused in the main traffic areas with oversupply been considered. If these builds are to be approved for areas such as ours, the size of the build should be approved in the way it blends into the area with the effect of traffic, privacy and traffic to be equivalent to a residential home with the average number of people this home would accommodate.

Obviously there are several personal reasons we don't want this development to proceed which will not be factored into the determination including concerns of devaluing our properties. We have worked hard to gain equity in our properties with it now potentially been reduced by this application. Myself and neighbours (from conversation) would like to see a reduction in the number of units between the two blocks for better management of traffic, parking, privacy and services in the street (stormwater etc).

Thank you for taking the time to read my email and if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards
Danielle McDonald