

Deputy Lord Mayor, Aldermen, Councillors, Members of the Committee,

I am representing a group of concerned residents, with properties adjacent to the proposed development at 19 Lillie St and the Glebe Residents Association.

I wish to initially address the alterations to the existing residence at 19 Lillie St.

Existing dwelling

Our concerns with regard to the proposal are related to privacy, amenity, neighbourhood character, and heritage pertaining to the existing dwelling. We believe these concerns have been addressed by the planning and heritage officers in their reports.

We have read and discussed the planning and heritage officer amendments and are in full support of ALL proposed amendments and conditions to the existing dwelling in the officer's report.

New dwelling

With regards to the proposal for a second, and additional dwelling - we do not support this component of the development application:

We have concerns regarding privacy, neighbourhood character, heritage, intended use of building, fencing, car space and proposed heating.

We considered it to be an inappropriate and excessive intensification of the site.

Should this proposal proceed there is the potential to create a precedent for developers to purchase property in the Glebe and undertake similar unsympathetic projects that would detract from the heritage character of the Glebe.

Related to this argument is what we see as the potential for a strata title application made with DA approval and the second dwelling become short term accommodation in an area where there are many existing visitor accommodation facilities. Further growth of visitor accommodation in a small suburb like the Glebe has the potential to detract from residential amenity and erode community fabric.

Concerns

If the proposed second dwelling development is approved:

- Consideration has been to be given to the reworking and the removal of the gable roof, proposing a skillion roof by the heritage and planning officers-although a flat roof is preferred.
- The Planning Officers report does not go far enough to address privacy on the north elevation of the site.
- In regard to the rear northern boundary fence, which is currently a component of the existing shed, the proposed replacement fence is not sufficient to provide adequate privacy.
- In addition, we question whether the shed, built prior to 1906, should in fact be considered heritage in nature
- Alternative heating to the wood heater provided

- Ease of use of the parking space is questionable which requires multiple manoeuvres to enter and exit the space.
- Residents should not need to incur remediation costs associated with maintaining current levels of amenity in existing backyards.

Recommendations

There are 2 recommendations we would like to put to the committee, the two proposals are intended to make the planning process work better in the future ,based on the experience of the current DA.

- The first is the recommendation to include a period of respectful, committed and documented consultation by developers with local residents regarding, their proposal, design and intended use of the site.
- The second is a proposal to amend the *Interim Planning Scheme 2015*, to include the heritage precinct of the Glebe under section *E13.8.3 Subdivision*
 - This states that “..residential properties must not be subdivided, other than for boundary adjustments that do not increase the development potential of lots.”

Thank you for your time and consideration of this deputation.