

[REDACTED]
8 July 2025

Re: SSD-48028209
State Significant Development for Opal St Ives Community Care
Seniors Housing project

Dear Commissioners

We are the proprietors and residents of [REDACTED]. The full length of our western boundary adjoins the easternmost boundary of the proposed development.

As a follow-up to our zoom meeting with the Commission on Thursday 3 July, this letter sets out our requests for the Commission to consider the impacts to our property from the proposal with regard to privacy and screening, general amenity and overshadowing.

The closeness and bulk of Home E and H building to our boundary has great negative impact on our property.

This building sits on the highest ground at the rear of our shared boundary. It is two storeys and sits 6.3 metres from the boundary. As the ground slopes down (southwards towards the front of the property) it means the southern face of the building is effectively three storeys high. The huge bulk of this structure is directly opposite our indoor and outdoor living areas.

Protruding from Home E and H building towards our boundary is the screened 'sit and learn' area and fire escape. These sit 3 metres from our boundary and are the full height of the building. In addition there is a ground level deck that is 3 metres from our boundary with connecting deck, stairs and landing that all sit 2 metres from our boundary.

The landing that sits 2 metres from our boundary intrudes into the structural root zone of our tree H(2). This very large old tree is vital for us to maintain some screening against the Home E and H building. Any damage to this tree would be devastating and take great expense and years for us to set right.

We understand setback of the design has been achieved in various ways in some places. We ask that this please be considered for our

property here also. The very high structure sitting just 3 metres from our living area is a huge imposition.

The screening to be included here for our privacy does not mitigate the impact of the mass of the structure so close to our indoor/outdoor living areas.

Any setback of the existing design would benefit our property as it would also lessen somewhat the impact of overshadowing.

The shadowing indicated on analysis shows significant overshadowing of our property (21 June 3pm). Our property goes from 2.7% of our site being in shadow to 28.2% of our site. This huge increase affects all of our exterior living area and all the windows and doors that open onto it.

In particular there is a great increase in shadow across our back seating, living area even by each equinox. The increase in shade in the back area goes from 0% to 8.1% in September and March and all of our outdoor living area is completely shaded. This is a dramatic decline in amenity which will greatly affect our enjoyment of this area. Our property is very well sited and easy to cool in summer and keep warm in winter. This shadowing will dramatically and negatively affect our comfort for most of the year.

Given the great size of the development there must be some options for changes to be made for further setback of this building.

Regarding our request for fencing of this boundary (as mentioned in the 3 July zoom meeting) we will be making separate application to the proponent.

We were unable to address these matters regarding the amended plans earlier for personal reasons due to significant health issues. We are grateful to have this opportunity to raise them with the Commission now.

[REDACTED]