

IVANHOE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIONS

Having viewed the Bates Smart and Hassel development proposal, my concerns as a property owner on Peachtree Road are as follows:

The proposal has isolated design criteria for the Ivanhoe site without taking due consideration of the Peachtree Road properties along the northern boundary. In the next 5-10 years, there is the likelihood of redevelopment of these residential properties designed to the new planning compliance with an FSR 3:1 and 45 m height. Any redevelopment should not be restricted by poor design decisions made in the Ivanhoe proposal for the B1.1 and B1.2 buildings and any special needs required by these facilities.

In particular:

1. The northern boundary setbacks proposed at 6m and 10m do not comply with council requirements and by the closeness will affect our properties.
2. The existing laneway on the shared boundary which provides public access, physical separation and a vegetation corridor from the Ivanhoe site has been removed and the boundary of Ivanhoe shifted to our rear boundary. This should not be allowed.
3. The design criteria for solar access and shadow analysis for the B1.1 and B1.2 buildings fail to take into account redevelopment of Peachtree Road on the northern side. Peachtree Road redevelopment should not have limitations and special conditions placed on its design by inadequate Ivanhoe design considerations.
4. Proximity and design of the proposed B1.1 and B1.2 buildings will create privacy issues for the planned passive and active open space and also sight lines between the adjacent developments.
5. Criteria 5.5 proposes the potential for extension of the mews for public pedestrian and cycle connection to Peachtree Road through the privately- owned properties. This imposes severe redevelopment limitations on our property and affects the private domain of its boundaries. Such a proposal need to be removed.

As final comment, the Ivanhoe proposal is an over-development of the site which is a direct consequence of the number, size and height of these residential buildings and insufficient open space proposed.