

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of [Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Rosebery Estate
Date: Sunday, 20 December 2020 2:17:58 PM

Submitted on Sun, 20/12/2020 - 14:17

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

Yes

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

2018

Submission

As a long time resident of Rosebery Estate, I wish to add my support to Clover Moore's campaign to exclude Rosebery from the current SEPP and support the EIE.

The original land owners of the Estate of Rosebery had the foresight to protect the well planned design intention of the garden suburb and protect the quality of the aesthetics and living environment/standards for future generations through the safety net of the covenant.

There is evidence that over the year, the Council and State have not done their duty in upholding the covenant and have been careless in allowing unlawful additions, double storeys and demolitions to take place contributing to the degradation of many of the homes in the Rosebery Estate.

We therefore now need to protect not only the living standards of residents by not increasing density drastically, but also, to protect the remaining Californian Bungalows and other homes of significant heritage while we can, before the Rosebery Estate is consumed by the multi dwelling, overcrowded surrounding areas of greater Rosebery and Zetland. We have a duty to respect and preserve the garden suburb of The Rosebery Estate for future generations.

I believe the Covenant should be analysed to ascertain the crux of the intention of the Covenant. For example, secondary dwellings (granny flats) were not common in 1912, and so there is no mention of them in the Covenant, however, one could argue that as long as there was a certain backyard ratio of land to house, and side and rear setback adhered to, that a secondary dwelling would be acceptable as it cannot be seen from the street or front of house. Similarly, a double storey addition to the rear of the house could be allowed as the roofline hides the addition from the street. The intention of the covenant really needs to be examined as there are some development alterations like these 2 examples that I believe should be allowed. (I also think that an architecturally sympathetic car port could also be allowed for various reasons).

I do not believe the covenant prevents the ability to improve, or renovate (sympathetically) to improve the value of one's home. In fact, for those residents who are concerned about this, I would direct them to the major renovation, addition and record sale prior to auction last week of [REDACTED]. I believe the creators of the covenant would have been delighted by the sympathetic and role- model way the owners restored the facade (even though rendered) keeping original windows, and heritage front garden whilst adding a contemporary rear addition and swimming pool. If all the homes in the Rosebery Estate were renovated/restored so sympathetically then undoubtedly, the suburb would skyrocket in resale value.

Unfortunately, if regulations are not carefully considered, put in place and enforced then we will see atrocities of cheap duplexes and multi dwelling homes where investors make a quick buck with no care or concern for our unique garden suburb.

Let's keep the integrity of the Rosebery Estate and honour the designer of the suburb's intention for future generations.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

I agree to the above statement

Yes