

From: DA Admin Mailbox
Sent: Thursday, 13 February 2025 8:51 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: DA2024/0492

From: Robert Scott [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 12 February 2025 2:43 PM
To: Thomas Prosser [REDACTED]
Subject: DA2024/0492

Dear Thomas

In our phone conversation yesterday I was alarmed to hear that a decision on the above DA2024/0492 was likely to be made before some significant documented objections from neighbouring residents were resolved including:

1. The scale of proposed earthworks, particularly the environmental and visual impact of large quantities of imported fill. These earthworks cannot be achieved without removal of significant and protected ("prescribed") trees.
2. The removal of prescribed trees in the proposed building envelopes.
3. The proximity of the proposed access road to neighbouring property on the Western boundary - I note that the "layby" parking arrangements have been extended since the original submission such that the "buffer" between road and neighbouring boundaries is now only 2 metres which is insufficient protection from the visual and acoustic intrusion from vehicles, people and streetlighting, even with the (limited) landscaping that is viable for this narrow space.

Each of the above are distinct and separate issues and therefore beyond the scope of DA2024/0492 itself. I believe under planning regulation these matters will require separate and specific approval, and attendant community consultation, over and above DA2024/0492.

However you explained to me that Council is considering the potential future earthworks, tree removal and access road design in its evaluation of DA2024/0492 . This approach is incompatible with statements contained in previous Council correspondence that these matters are beyond the scope of DA2024/0492 . For the avoidance of doubt, the neighbouring residents expect to participate in open and transparent future consultation on these matters of significant community interest as and when the relevant applications are submitted, rather than behind closed doors under the limited and defined scope of DA2024/0492.

Should DA2024/0492 be approved in its current and limited form, I am concerned that a precedent will be set for future development activity (earthworks, tree removal, road design) against the expectations and wishes of neighbouring residents, and without transparent and timely community engagement required under the traditional DA process.

I trust that my concerns will be addressed before Council's finalisation of DA2024/0492

Regards
Robert Scott

